Durham E-Theses

Narratives of Collaboration in Post-War France, 1944 – 1974

LAWRIE, RICHARD,MARSHALL,ALEXANDER

How to cite:

LAWRIE, RICHARD,MARSHALL,ALEXANDER (2013) *Narratives of Collaboration in Post-War France, 1944 – 1974*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7374/

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
http://etheses.dur.ac.uk

Narratives of Collaboration in Post-War France, 1944 – 1974

Richard Lawrie

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
School of Modern Languages and Cultures
University of Durham
2013

Narratives of Collaboration on Post-War France, 1944–1974

ABSTRACT

Arguing that literary narratives (whether fictional or autobiographical) can provide an important way in which the past is accessed and understood, this thesis uses such narratives to compare and contrast cultural representations of collaboration with the Gaullist political accounts described in Henry Rousso's *Le Syndrome de Vichy*. Following the introduction, chapter one examines the perception and characteristics of collaboration, providing a broad analysis of collaboration and collaborators which frames later chapters. There follows a discussion of the generic boundaries between history, autobiography and fiction, showing that novels can contain many of the attributes conventionally ascribed to historical texts, as well as having a freedom of form which allows them to examine and relate subjects not allowed to historical accounts. Next, selected novels (by Marcel Aymé, Jean-Louis Bory, Marie Chaix, Céline, Jean-Louis Curtis, Jean Dutourd, Pascal Jardin, Patrick Modiano, Saint-Loup, and Michel Tournier) are analysed at length to examine how specific forms of collaboration have been understood, and how they subvert Rousso's schema of repression or marginalisation of the phenomenon. Novels written in the immediate aftermath of the war actually gave a convincing representation of collaboration and the everyday wartime experience, contrasting with the 'official' story which sought to forget collaboration. Representations of intellectual and cultural collaboration show that, contrary to de Gaulle's attempts to portray France as a nation of resisters, high-profile figures from these circles offered a more persuasive alternative to this view. This is also shown to be the case for depictions of military and paramilitary collaboration, which openly describe armed and violent collaboration, challenging and contrasting with the Gaullist representation of mass resistance supported by the civil population. Finally, familial memories are used to revaluate the *mode rétro* in light of earlier chapters. Although this phenomenon found innovative ways to view the war, it did not represent a wholly new, or more open, account, and was subject to its own repressions and distortions.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations are used within footnotes for the principal novels consulted.

ABB	Jean Dutourd, *Au Bon beurre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).
BdC	Patrick Modiano, *Les Boulevards de ceinture* (Paris: Gallimard, 1983).
CA	Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *D'un château l'autre* (Paris, Gallimard, 1957).
CdE	Marcel Aymé, *Le Chemin des écoliers* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972).
FdlN	Jean-Louis Curtis, *Les forêts de la nuit* (Paris: J'ai Lu, 1979).
GNA	Pascal Jardin, *La Guerre à neuf ans* (Paris: Grasset, 1989).
LH	Saint-Loup, *Les Hérétiques* (Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1965).
LLC	Marie Chaix, *Les Lauriers du Lac de Constance* (Paris: Seuil, 1974).
MV	Jean-Louis Bory, *Mon village à l'heure allemande* (Paris: J'ai Lu, 1967).
RdA	Tournier, Michel, *Le Roi des aulnes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970).
RdN	Patrick Modiano *La Ronde de nuit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969).

I acknowledge the financial support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council in the production of this thesis.

Introduction: *Le Syndrome de Vichy* and Literary Representations of Collaboration

The primary purpose of this thesis is to examine how post-war French fictional literary narratives throughout the period 1944 to 1974 understood and represented collaboration between members of the French population and Germany during the Second World War. This examination will enable judgements to be made as to whether such fictional narratives mirror the account of official state-sponsored repression of collaboration memories given by Henry Rousso in his seminal 1987 *Le Syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours*.[1] This understanding of remembrance of the war saw collective state memory dominated by a Gaullist view of the past, which only began to give way after the wide-ranging cultural and political changes that occurred in the aftermath of the May 1968 riots. As Rousso's work has predominated, it has greatly influenced studies which examine how the war was remembered in France.[2] However, is it the case that novels complement current historians' accounts, which offer a far more nuanced and realistic view of the war? If this is shown to be so, it will illustrate that novels during the period 1944 to 1974 differ in their accounts of the Occupation from those related by the dominant political groups, which in turn would suggest that French society as a whole was offered, and accepted, a far more accurate depiction of the Occupation than that presented by those in power during this period.

---

[1] Henry Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil, 2nd ed. 1990).

[2] For a recent major example of the influence of Rousso's work on literary representations of the war, see Yan Hamel, *La Bataille des mémoires: La Seconde Guerre mondiale et le roman français* (Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2006), p. 12 and throughout.

To answer the question of whether accounts of collaboration differ from those of dominant political groups, shifts in social and moral attitudes to collaboration that such fictional narratives portray will be examined. In addition, examination of how such shifts are reflected through modifications in the representations of specific individual and group collaboration will also be made. To realize this, a number of considerations will be taken into account. How were these developments in social and moral attitudes represented, and to what extent did literary styles and techniques imitate or innovate on previous literary works which examined collaboration? Moreover, in light of this work, by questioning whether these developments mirror current views on the understanding and representation of collaboration that have been described by existing works on the subject, the thesis will also address two particular questions: firstly, is Henry Rousso's metaphor of sickness and obsession, together with related ideas, relevant to the image of collaborators and collaboration contained in these fictional narratives? Or, do they instead provide a more historically accurate understanding of collaboration than the advocates of such metaphors would suggest - and if so, to what extent? Secondly, what conclusions can be drawn from aspects of collaboration that are not represented in fictional narratives during the period that study has identified as being important elements of collaboration? This examination will address which issues were considered taboo, and to what extent, as well as which subjects were neglected due to their mundane nature having made them seemingly uninteresting or unimportant topics.

Prior to discussion of methodology, research context and sources, it is necessary to give initial consideration to the terms and concepts of collaboration and fictional

narratives, and to provide an introductory framework through which this thesis can be understood (before fuller discussion of these terms and concepts in later chapters). It is most important to define what is meant by collaboration as an historical concept. As this thesis examines how France's wartime was understood in novels, which are drawn from a large corpus, collaboration is taken in its widest possible sense, encompassing both narrow and broad definitions, and allowing for wider conclusions to be reached. Collaboration therefore pertains to French people involved individually or jointly, willingly or unwillingly, in activities or projects which benefited the German state and its citizens materially and culturally during the period of the Second World War.[3]

In addition to this historical concept, the general term used to understand sources used in this thesis - 'fictional narrative' - must also be explained, at a most basic level, to avoid confusion and establish the parameters of the work. Fiction, in its strictest form, is considered to be prose literature which describes imaginary people and events, which are in the literal sense untrue. Thus, conversely, non-fiction exclusively represents and recounts factual events (for example, biographies, such as Marc Ferro's *Pétain*, which details the Marshal Pétain's life and career through verifiable sources,[4] or histories, such as Emmanuel Thiébot's *Chroniques de la vie des Français sous l'Occupation*, which tells the story of the war with a collection of contemporary documents[5]). However, this definition is problematic and

[3] Collaboration and its meaning are discussed in detail in chapter one. A term closely linked to collaboration, if only as an antonym, is the concept of resistance. The Resistance was a collection of individual groups dedicated to fighting both the occupying Germans and the collaborating French governments of Pétain (based at the spa town of Vichy, and often referred to as the Vichy Government, or simply Vichy) through the use of violent physical force, although non-violent resistance also took place. For a history of the development of resistance to the Germans, see Laurent Douzou, *La Résistance française: une histoire périlleuse* (Paris: Seuil, 2005).
[4] Marc Ferro, *Pétain* (Paris: Fayard, 1993).
[5] Emmanuel Thiébot, *Chroniques de la vie des Français sous l'Occupation* (Paris: Larousse, 2011).

unsatisfactory, for fictional works usually contain elements which are not imaginary, as novels set during the Second World War clearly illustrated, to a greater or lesser degree. Such novels reflect real people and situations, and comment on most aspects of the war. In this way, for example, André Héléna's *Les Salauds ont la vie dure*, first published in 1949 and remaining in print today, can be seen as an exploration of the criminal world under the Occupation, providing a stinging attack on the collaborationist activity of the French police, the Milice, and the criminal underworld with the German occupiers.[6] This then supports the historical record, and its fictional representation can be compared to that of historian Jean-Marc Berlière, in his archive-based study *Policiers français sous l'Occupation*.[7] All of these examples, and the sources used by this thesis (including both novels studied and secondary materials) are, consequently, and despite such differences, narratives. A narrative is a 'story' created in a constructed format (and in the case of this thesis, a work of writing) that describes a sequence of fictional or non-fictional events: essentially, narrative 'discourse' fashions a 'story' (a simple sequence of events in time) into an organized structure that can be understood by the reader.[8]

All novels therefore contain elements considered to reflect real life, and it is this fact that makes novels vehicles by which the past can be understood: individuals and groups can gain understanding of the world which they inhabit through the reading of novels. Much understanding and knowledge of the past comes not from researched works of history, but from novels set in a past time. Importantly,

[6] André Héléna, *Les salauds ont la vie dure* (Paris: E-dite, 2011).
[7] Jean-Marc Berlière, *Policiers français sous l'Occupation: D'après les archives de l'épuration* (Paris: Perrin, 2009).
[8] The nature of fictional narratives and the similarities between fiction, autobiography and history and how this relates to their functions as sources of information and understanding are discussed in detail in chapter three.

because of this, novels portraying occupied France can be used to examine how collaboration was portrayed and comprehended. Indeed, as Margaret Atack has shown, during the war itself novels performed an important function in attempting to convince their readership to support resistance against the occupier, through fictive representation of real-life situations.[9] Although they largely fall outside the scope of this work, it is important to acknowledge the significance of novels written in the wartime period, not least because they were the genesis for future novels on the war, but also because they show the value of such works as tools by which people learnt about the world around them. In the myth-making of the time, they served as important tools which could perpetuate and also challenge common contemporary myths, disseminated by all sides in the conflict. By attempting to engage their readership in a manner which allowed human insight and understanding to access stories and situations, represented in a manner which could elicit empathy, novels were powerful tools which could both influence and reflect the views of those who read them.

For example, Robert Brasillach's 1944 novel *Six heures à perdre*, written during the Occupation, provides a collaborationist view of the war years.[10] It refers to Resistance members as 'terrorists' or 'dissidents', imitating language employed by the Vichy government.[11] Primarily, *Six heures à perdre* is the tale of a newly-

[9] Margaret Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural politics and narrative forms, 1940-1950* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), pp. 232–235.
[10] For a discussion on how texts (such as *Six heures à perdre*) are determined as novels rather than autobiography, see chapter two.
[11] Robert Brasillach, *Six heures à perdre* (Paris: Plon, 1953). Although *Six heures à perdre* was not published as a novel until 1953, it was serialised in *Révolution Nationale* from March to June 1944. Alice Kaplan, *The Collaborator: the trial & execution of Robert Brasillach* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p.54. Brasillach was controversially executed for intellectual collaboration in 1945. His most consistently high-profile activity in this area was his editorship of the pro-fascist newspaper *Je Suis Partout.*

released prisoner of war (the narrator, Robert B.), who is spending a day in Paris between trains home. There he meets his best friend's girlfriend, and she provides the focus for a detective novel, as the narrator attempts to discover information about her dilemma-filled existence. Beyond this, however, *Six heures à perdre* relates further issues. In addition to the novel's attitude to the Resistance, for example, it can also be read as a criticism of French disunity at the time of writing.[12]

Beyond the novel's representation of such political themes, some of which would be highly controversial and largely unacceptable during parts of the period studied in this thesis (such as its views of the Resistance), it also provides simple yet accurate portrayals of Parisian life under the Occupation. This can be seen in the description of occupied Paris given to Robert B. by Madame Bizard, a malevolent gossip:

> J'écoutais Mme Bizard dévider ses récits cahotiques, où se mêlaient l'an 40 et les méfaits des grands, et les désordres des mœurs, et ainsi se reconstituait pour moi, à défaut d'indications précises sur la personnalité exacte de sa locataire, une vie dont il est vrai que nous n'avons pas eu, dans nos camps, beaucoup d'idée. Le premier hiver, personne n'était organisé pour s'habituer à sa nouvelle existence. Le marché noir n'existait pratiquement pas, et était même souvent, chose étrange, condamné par l'opinion publique. Une vague de morale passait sur le pays. On croyait à la Révolution nationale. Les équipes du Secours d'hiver et les enfants des écoles visitaient les maisons pour récolter une assiette, une fourchette, une cuillère et une poignée de laine à matelas destinées aux réfugiés. Heureux de se sentir en vie, après avoir craint le pire, il semblait que les Français eussent abordé la saison froide avec l'insouciance de la cigale.[13]

[12] Pascal Louvrier, *Brasillach: L'illusion fasciste* (Paris: Perrin, 1989), p. 202.
[13] Brasillach, *Six heures à perdre*, p. 30.

Such an example illustrates that novels easily reflected the realities of the period and provide a description which would be recognised not only by Parisians, but by people from larger towns and cities, and would also provide insight to those who did not have direct experience of the situation described.

Whilst *Six heures à perdre* was written near-contemporaneously to the events it describes (whilst Paris was still occupied), it is quite possible in terms of content that it could have been written at any time since the war, and be part of the wide corpus of post-war novels set during the war years. Such post-war novels reflect the realities of that time and provide a readily understandable description to those who live in later periods. Whilst each novel can be seen as different (to a greater or lesser extent) in terms of storyline and focus, details of the world they describe are readily comparable. For example, *Six heures à perdre*'s description can be compared with Jacques Brenner's 1954 *L'Atelier du photographe*.[14] Whilst *Six heures à perdre* can be described as a detective story, *L'Atelier du photographe* (set again in Paris) instead examines the problems and pains of adolescence, examining difficult family situations, school, and, in particular, the discovery of sex and sexuality. The characters' somewhat carefree teenage world is forever ended by the war and occupation. The novel chronicles the impact of the times, from the defeat of 1940 to everyday occupation, including the *service du travail obligatoire*, and increasing violence and repression. The novel also references arrests and imprisonments of Jews in Drancy (and later of those accused of collaboration), Jacques Doriot and the *Parti populaire français*, the *Légion des volontaires*

[14] Jacques Brenner, *L'Atelier du photographe* (Paris: Julliard, 1954).

français contre le bolchevisme, divisions between the French and the indifference of the majority, collaboration, and the *épuration*.

L'Atelier du photographe is not simply an illustration of the novel's ability to present the past, however; it does so in broader and more diverse ways than other methods of viewing and judging previous events, such as historical, judicial or political means. Novels such as these are therefore also capable of examining at greater depth their representation and recreation of the past. Through their power to create stories and depict and elucidate situations, they access and represent areas hidden to media which rely on provable facts and testimony, or at least strong circumstantial evidence. Such issues are readily present in the experiences of *les Tondues*, women who had their heads shaved at the time of the Liberation to mark out and punish them for perceived 'horizontal' collaboration with the occupying Germans.[15] Societal, judicial, political and historical evidence for *les Tondues* exists, with witness statements recording their treatment alongside the judgements of courts and attitudes of local governments, all of which feed into the historical record and complement contemporary photographic evidence.[16] Yet the voices of those subjected to having their heads shaved have remained silent, presumably caused by factors such as guilt and trauma, alongside a desire to forget such an experience. This widespread desire to forget such events (both in cases of women actively collaborating with the Germans, and those innocent of anything more than simple romance, convicted in many cases by little more than kangaroo courts) creates an interesting situation. Whilst head-shavings are clearly recorded, they

[15] Fabrice Virgili, *La France "virile": des femmes tondues à la libération*, (Paris: Payot, 2000), p. 7.
[16] Alison M. Moore, 'History, Memory and Trauma in Photography of the Tondues: Visuality of the Vichy Past through the Silent Image of Women', Gender & History 17, 1995, pp. 657–681.

were done so almost entirely from the perspective of those who viewed, as spectators, the punishment of others. Thus the central individuals involved in these situations remain without testimony; the only way to bring their experiences to life is to resort to fictional methods based on human intuition: only through fictive means can their stories be told, allowing the author to go beyond the strict historical record.[17] One such novel is Frédéric Dard's *La Crève* (1946), a novel set in a room in which a family of four has gathered at the Liberation. Whilst the son has been a *milicien* and is guilty of the death of many resisters, his sister Hélène has been sleeping with German soldiers during the Occupation and knows that if she leaves the house she will have her head shaved, allowing the reader to access the fear many women felt during the period. This fear is realised when Hélène leaves the house disguised, attempting to find a way in which the family can leave town, but is discovered and has her head shaved.[18] Hélène's fictional reflection on how she has come to such a traumatic fate gives representation to the central figures of these historic events that history cannot.

However, whilst *les Tondues* illustrate a lacuna in the historical record, created by the desire of both those who were punished and wider society to avoid discussing the events that took place, they also illustrate that novels themselves do not always deal comprehensively with the past. Prior to Alain Renais's 1959 film *Hiroshima mon amour*, the subject was seldom dealt with as the primary focus of fictive forms, with the majority of novels focusing on *les Tondues* dating from the 1970s

[17] Although it must be stated that ability and freedom do not always ensure that fictive works exist to allow access to shadowy areas of the past: novels on collaboration and the civil service are few.
[18] Frédéric Dard, *La Crève* (Lyon: Confluences, 1946). Hélène's story after her initial head-shaving is completed in Dard's sequel, *Batailles sur la route* (Saint-Etienne: Editions Dumas, 1949). For further discussion of *Les Tondues* and this subject see chapter one.

onwards.[19] Yet despite this, such works remain the only 'voice' given to victims of shavings. Works such as *Hiroshima mon amour*, whose script was written by the novelist Marguerite Duras (and which gave the film a 'fictionist's perspective'),[20] illustrate not only the ability of fictive forms to access the subject, but also their ability to question the past, as well as present the public with situations and views it may find unpalatable. Historians and the judiciary require evidence (and, although there are notable exceptions - such as Maurice Papon - judicial proceedings are largely contemporaneous), whilst politicians are unwilling to present society with unpleasant truths. General de Gaulle's view of the war was widely accepted (if not in actuality believed) for many years after the war because it was convenient and in many ways necessary to France's recovery.[21] Factors such as these would therefore have left the story of those who had their heads shaved at the Liberation firmly out of the national consciousness. It can therefore be argued that the few references to *les Tondues'* existence in the post-war period in novels, alongside *Hiroshima mon amour,* returned the subject to mainstream consciousness; they also questioned judgements made, both in practical and emotional terms, against those deemed guilty, through their sympathetic portrayal of women recalling their treatment at the Liberation and the need for therapeutic confession.[22]

---

[19] One notable exception is Henri-Georges Clouzot's 1949 film *Manon* (an updated version of Abbé Prevost's 1731 novel *Manon Lescaut*) which sees a Resistance fighter rescue a woman from villagers who are convinced she is a collaborator.

[20] John W. Moses, 'Vision Denied in Night and Fog and Hiroshima Mon Amour', *Literature/Film Quarterly* 14 (1987), p. 161.

[21] For further discussions on de Gaulle's views, see the beginnings of chapters three, four, five and six.

[22] *Hiroshima mon amour* can also be seen as an anti-Gaullist view of the past, brought about by Duras's contemporaneous dislike of de Gaulle and his political activities. Laure Adler, *Marguerite Duras* (Paris: Gallimard, 1998), p. 328, p. 360.

The freedom that is allowed within fictive forms means they can portray and examine issues or events from a variety of viewpoints. This manifold approach allows for a presentation of the past that takes in individual experiences whilst simultaneously dealing with a number of other factors, such as the wider effects of the war on society. This therefore makes fictive works important as tools for discovery of the past. As Pierre Nora has pointed out in his wide-ranging *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, it is essential to look in various ways at which France's past can be understood, because it is impossible to comprehend how people understand the country's past by looking at simply one memory.[23] In this way, the examination of novels on collaboration complements and develops existing works on memories of the war in France. In particular this applies to the work of Henry Rousso, whose work largely examines only political memory. Whilst Rousso's examination of the Gaullist political strand represents an important area of memory, it is not one that can claim to be a true recollection of the war for all France.

There are many studies on France's understanding of its wartime past which this thesis will supplement and advance. In wider terms there are works such as Adam Nossiter's 2003 *France and the Nazis: Memories, Lies and the Second World War*, which examine general memories of the past, whilst others, such as Claire Gorrara's work on representations in detective fiction of wartime France, focus specifically on literary memories within a particular genre.[24] However, many of

[23] Pierre Nora 'La Fin de l'Histoire-Mémoire' in Pierre Nora (ed.) *Les Lieux de mémoire I – La République* (Paris : Gallimard, 1984), pp. xvii – xlii.
[24] For example see Claire Gorrara, *French Crime Fiction and the Second World War: Past Crimes, Present Memories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012); '"Meurtres pour mémoire": remembering the Occupation in the detective fiction of Didier Daeninckx', in Debra Kelly (ed.) *Remembering and Representing the Experience of War in Twentieth-Century France: Committing to Memory* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), pp. 131-140; 'Forgotten crimes? Representing

these works rest on the highly influential and pioneering 1987 study of Henry Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy: De 1944 à nos jours* which has justly become a key reference in the field of memory studies of the Second World War. For Rousso, 'Le Syndrome de Vichy est l'ensemble hétérogène des symptômes, des manifestations, en particulier dans la vie politique, sociale et culturelle, qui révèlent l'existence du traumatisme engendré par l'Occupation, particulièrement lié aux divisions internes, traumatisme qui s'est maintenu, parfois développé, après la fin des événements'.[25] Rousso argues that this process has undergone four stages, each with unique facets, derived from a psychoanalytic framework. From 1944 to 1953 was the period of *le deuil inachevé*. This period of 'unfinished mourning' dealt with the immediate aftermath of the war and aspects of civil war, and the divisions caused in French society up to the amnesties of the early 1950s. Because of the need to unite a fractured nation and heal divisions caused by war and its aftermath, memories of the war were incompletely dealt with. This period was followed by one of repression based on the amnesties of the very early 1950s: *le refoulement*. This period was typified by *les trente glorieuses*, and more specifically *la République gaullienne*, which matched the comfort of financial growth with a similarly comfortable view of the past. This was based on a representation that displayed minimal collaboration, and a near-unified national response in the face of the invader and in support of the Resistance, personified by de Gaulle (the chief proponent of this view). This period was ended by a marked change brought about by *le retour du refoulé*. From 1968 onwards a series of political and cultural events shattered the reassuring myth of national resistance that had been fostered, leading

---

Jewish Experience of the Second World War in French Crime Fiction', *South Central Review* 27, 1-2, (2010), pp. 3-20.

[25] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy,* pp. 18-19.

to the period known as *le miroir brisé*, with the wartime memory of a nation being largely united in resistance fractured by emerging revelations. This shattering of the mirror lasted until 1974, beginning a chain of events that led to a national obsession with France's wartime role.

The cultural nature of *le miroir brisé* merits some mention, as this is the first period in which Rousso pays large-scale attention to cultural forms. The first cultural form to merit detailed examination (seen as key to the development of *le miroir brisé*) is Marcel Ophuls's 1971 *Le Chagrin et la pitié*. This undoubtedly ground-breaking documentary, which can be seen as a counter-myth to the state-sponsored Gaullist view of the past, takes as its focus daily life in Clermont-Ferrand, a city portrayed as being typical of occupied France. The 'grand' narrative of the Occupation, of official ceremonies and political pronouncements that epitomised the Gaullist view of the war years, is almost completely ignored. Whilst members of the Resistance are present (such as Emile Coulaudon, known as "Gaspar", leader of the Auvergne maquis), the film is also notable for its inclusion of former collaborators, including René de Chambrun, Pierre Laval's son-in-law, as well as the photogenic Christian de la Mazière, a former pro-Nazi member of the Waffen SS Charlemagne Division. However, it was not simply the presentation of 'bad' collaborators that shocked. The film also interviews a number of 'everyday' individuals who willingly went along with Vichy: echoes of Vichyite anti-Semitic rhetoric are present in defences offered by two former schoolteachers when they can no longer evade questions about the fate of Jewish colleagues.[26]

[26] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 118 – 136. Rousso's examination of fictive cultural forms exists for the period of *le miroir brisé* alone, and is unmatched in his discussion of previous periods.

Le Chagrin et la pitié coincided with what has come to be called the *mode rétro*, which can be described as a "forties revival", not only in novels but also in other cultural forms.[27] Within this renewal of interest in, and re-evaluation of, the Occupation, collaboration and less heroic aspects of France's war years made a return to the national consciousness, and were the focus of much interest and attention.[28] The most influential novelist of this period was Patrick Modiano, part of a group of writers whose work investigated the war years and focused on images of collaboration; an Occupation of round-ups, repression, and anti-Semitism. This period is discussed in further detail in chapter six. Aside from the works of Modiano, many others contain elements which can be seen as key components of the *mode rétro*, such as Viviane Forrester's 1970 *Ainsi des exilés*.[29] Although Forrester's novel is set in the Netherlands, the themes it examines can be directly applied to France and the *mode rétro*. Set in 1960, the main character is Sarah, who has fled to a Dutch seaside town to escape memories of deported loved ones. She has chosen this place for the peace the ocean brings; the ocean is the subject of lengthy descriptions, with its conveyed beauty providing an initial sense of calm. However, this proves illusory. Sarah cannot escape her past, and pushes everyone away, including her young lover. As the novel develops, it becomes apparent that it is not just Sarah (representative of the individual), but the whole town (a metaphor for wider society) that is haunted by memories of the period, and of what they did not see or prevent. This inability or failure to act can be seen as an important aspect of the *mode rétro*, which drove novelists to question how far France was complicit in the activities of the occupying Germans. Moreover, born in 1927, Forrester was a

[27] For further details on the *mode rétro*, see chapter six.
[28] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy,* pp.149 - 154.
[29] Viviane Forrester, *Ainsi des exilés* (Paris: Denoël, 1970).

Parisian Jew who survived the war by going into hiding with her family, which gives her direct experience of the subjects and themes she describes.[30]

The attention Rousso himself paid to fictive sources during the period of *le miroir brisé* is of importance to this thesis, and suggestive of the approach that this work takes in its examination of novels, presenting a schema that can be developed further. Have attitudes to and representations of *les années noires* during these four chronological stages been present in novels? In terms of *le miroir brisé* was there, as Rousso suggests, a period of incomplete coming to terms with the war and a repression of memory of collaboration, followed in the late 1960s and early 1970s by a new view of the war that shattered existing understanding of the past, which can be seen in novels written in this period? Or, crucial to this work, did the *mode rétro* build on existing works? These issues are important as a modification and development of Rousso's work itself, but also add extra depth and background to works related to the subject of memory of wartime France.

Historiography

Illustration of Rousso's historiographical importance can be seen in Richard J. Golsan's 2000 *Vichy's Afterlife – History and Counter History in Postwar France,* which opens with a defining quote of Rousso's: 'In the late 1970s, I began work on the history of the Vichy regime, obviously still a subject of heated controversy. Nevertheless, in all innocence, I thought sufficient time had passed to allow me to wield my scalpel. But the corpse was still warm. It was too soon for the pathologist to do an autopsy; what the case called for was a doctor qualified to treat the living,

[30] For further information on Forrester's life, see Viviane Forrester, *Ce soir, après la guerre* (Paris: Fayard, 1997).

not the dead'.[31] From this quote, Golsan's introduction stems, and provides a suitable starting point for a selection of essays on France's difficult memories which takes its lead from Rousso. Whilst the majority of these are analyses of subjects which occurred from 1968 onwards (examining such issues as the trial of Paul Touvier and the controversy over President Mitterrand's youthful flirtation with the extreme right), they do however rest on an understanding of factors which see repression of memory until 1968 as being constant.[32] This acceptance of Rousso is based on convincing arguments. For, according to Golsan, 'if popular memory and public perceptions of the Vichy period have undergone a number of occasionally contradictory and always unsettling changes, the same can be said, to a significant degree, of the scholarly historiography of the period'.[33] This reveals something of the power of Rousso's argument. The state-sponsored memory which he details is mirrored in the development of the historiography of the Occupation.

Golsan illustrates his point about the work of historians on Vichy prior to his 2000 work by providing a brief yet comprehensive outline of major work undertaken on the subject. He discusses the work of Henri Michel and the *Comité d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale*, which, throughout the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s, focused on issues such as the Resistance and the activities of the Germans in France, whilst the work of Robert Aron saw the Vichy regime as a 'shield' for France, which attempted to mitigate the worst excesses of the Occupation. Taken as a whole, these generally downplay collaboration, and their primary focus on the Resistance and the Germans is representative of most historiography to 1968, when

[31] Rousso quoted in Richard J. Golsan, *Vichy's Afterlife – History and Counterhistory in Postwar France* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), p. 1.
[32] For the following discussion, see Golsan, *Vichy's Afterlife*, pp. 9–14.
[33] *Ibid*., p. 10.

Eberhard Jäckel's 1966 *Frankreich in Hitlers Europa* was published in French.[34] This was followed in 1972 by the more widely-know *Vichy France – Old Guard and New Order* by Robert Paxton, translated and published in France in 1973.[35] Both undermined the myth of a France united in Resistance, and instead brought collaboration out of the shadows, associating Vichy and collaboration with France as a whole rather than to limited minority groups within society.[36]

This analysis of historiography carried out by Golsan therefore both supports and complements Rousso's analysis of memory. However, as Golsan's introductory chapter also shows, further work is yet to be done on the subject of understanding how France's wartime past was viewed. His comparison of the historiographical approach and the realms of public perception and popular memory demonstrates room for further work on the subject. Whilst historiography is one part of this, it is by no means the complete story, as works of history are only one means by which the past is understood. Therefore, whilst a discussion of historiography is present, popular memory and public perception are left unexplored, the basis of understanding resting on Rousso's work.

One of the earliest works to provide a wide-ranging account of literature on France in the Second World War and its relationship to wider society was Margaret Atack, in her 1989 *Literature and the French Resistance – Cultural politics and narrative forms, 1940-1950*. Examining the problems of collaboration and resistance from a

---

[34] Eberhard Jäckel, *Frankreich in Hitlers Europa: die deutsche Frankreichpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1966).
[35] Robert O. Paxton, *Vichy France – Old Guard and New Order 1940-1944* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1972).
[36] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 288-289. For an example of the contemporary analysis Paxton's work engendered, see Marc Ferro, 'Maréchal, nous sommes toujours là', *La Quinzaine littéraire*, 16 February 1973.

perspective which allows a 'complex ideological battle' to emerge, Atack clearly shows the importance of novels in the construction of reality for individuals and groups involved.[37] Whilst, during Atack's period of study, the war was either still being fought or had only recently ended, giving her novels a particular importance in the society they were written, her central argument that they shape reality and understanding remains relevant to later periods, and is critical to this study.[38] Atack's work has rightly been praised for providing a broadly representative analysis of the novels of the period (examining just fewer than 100). However, this approach highlights the difficulties of dealing with such a sizeble corpus, as works are dealt with on the whole only briefly,[39] illustrating the dichotomy between focused studies which provide detailed in-depth examinations, and wider studies which lack such exhaustive examinations, but comment on wider trends.

Yet it is possible to glean more in terms of approach from Atack's work. Her vital point that resistance was not only a military action, but also an ideological one, with all that implies for literary output, can similarly be applied to collaboration, as well as to France's understanding of the war in the decades after the close of Atack's study. This point is particularly relevant for the concept of collaboration, and, by dint of that, resistance, in the post-war period. Although physical fighting ended in 1945, and the vast majority of trials for those accused of collaboration over by the very early 1950s, the battle for meaning and understanding continued in print, by then the central viable and openly-available discourse in which battles of

[37] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance*, p. 235.
[38] Atack has also noted in later work that narratives of the war which examined issues of collaboration continued to be written, and were not completely dominated by Gaullist views. See Margaret Atack, *May '68 in French Fiction and Film: Rethinking Society, Rethinking Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 106.
[39] Christopher Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France: Representing Treason and Sacrifice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 10.

identification and representation could freely be made. In the post-war trials, battle lines were often drawn around legal arguments aimed at achieving a guilty or not-guilty verdict, rather than attempting to achieve a full realisation of historical facts, leaving many in France - from both resistance and collaborating backgrounds - unsatisfied.[40]

This dissatisfaction links to an important point made by Atack when she comments that the novels she studied 'demonstrate that the "truth" of an event is discursively constructed', underlining the importance of novels in the understanding of events.[41] These are views also advocated in later works, such as William Cloonan's *The Writing of War: French and German Fiction and World War II*. Cloonan's work primarily focuses on a limited corpus of novels and examines six authors that Cloonan believes offer 'original responses to World War II; responses that articulate, in a variety of fashions, how that war was different from preceding ones and would have lasting ramifications for the writing of literature'.[42] Like Atack, Cloonan sees the social constructions novels create as important, particularly when they articulate a past that, at times, appears incomprehensible. Novels that do so - well - remind us that the 'contribution fiction makes to society can be eminently practical', [43] particularly as attempts during the *épuration* to respond to and judge the war years became inseparable from France's internal and external conflicts.[44]

---

[40] Peter Novick, *The Resistance Versus Vichy – The Purge of Collaborators in Liberated France* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1968), pp. 188-9.
[41] This does not however assume that there is no real past. For more on the subject of history as a construction, see chapter two.
[42] William Cloonan, *The Writing of War: French and German Fiction during World War II* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1999), p. 16.
[43] *Ibid*., p. 172.
[44] Jean-Paul Cointet, *Expier Vichy: L'épuration en France 1943 - 1958* (Paris: Perrin, 2008), p. 473.

Attack's approach is noted and developed by Christopher Lloyd in his 2003 *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France – Representing Treason and Sacrifice*. The overall aim of that work was to examine how people who lived through the Occupation represented and recorded experiences, with particular attention paid to concepts of treason and sacrifice.[45] Whilst this focus differentiates Lloyd's work from this thesis, which does not necessarily require any involvement with the Occupation or the war, in reality it is difficult to find novels on the Occupation from the period of the war to 1974 written by individuals who do not have some connection with the war, either as adults or children, whether in familial terms, or as part of the wider community. Even those writing who were too young to remember the war, or were born after it, were writing within the enveloping shadow of its aftermath, their work heavily influenced by the society in which they were raised. Within this thesis, this 'generational axis' is important, even if the concept is problematic, as it highlights the close relationship to the war years afforded by generational position.[46] Because of these factors, the overall methodological approach adopted by Lloyd to utilise his corpus can also be embraced by this thesis, as it allows for the observation and understanding of how novels written after the war are important tools for examining how the war was remembered. As discussed above, even if novels do not relate a 'real' past (in the strictest historical sense), they can recreate and evoke the mentality of a period. This is the approach Lloyd adopts in dealing with novels, memoirs and films, and it is his understanding of the operation of history that is adopted in this thesis.

---

[45] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. viii.
[46] Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett & Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European Memories of the Second World War* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999), pp. xxvii–xxviii.

Lloyd clearly argues that literary representations are forms which allow understanding of the past, raising the point that, despite conventional differences between the genres of history, fiction and autobiography, this is a situation that does not largely exist in reality.[47] This is due to society's understanding of the past not being based solely on works of history, but rather on a wide variety of sources, ranging from books and documentaries that fulfil the traditional understanding of history, through memoirs and more personal approaches to the past, and into films and novels. In reality, both the individual and society reach an understanding of the past from a mixture of all such genres (and more besides) rather than from works which are narrowly defined as belonging to the genre of history. This mixture of 'fact' and 'fiction' does not, however, mean that Lloyd subscribes to what is termed 'extreme postmodernism' and a belief that there is no such thing as a verifiable historical past, thus making all genres of equal value. By beginning with Hayden White's assertions that 'historical discourse is possible only on the presumption of the existence of the past as something about which it is possible to speak meaningfully' and that 'every history is first and foremost a verbal artifact', Lloyd goes on to argue that the past is a discursive construction, but that 'some reconstructions are more useful than others'.[48] In essence, there is such a thing as a verifiable past, and some reconstructions are indeed 'more useful than others' in revealing and communicating this past to contemporary audiences.

The points Lloyd makes in his work are a development of those made by Catherine Brosman in *Visions of War in France: Fiction, Art, Ideology*, a wide-ranging study which examines representations of war from the reign of Napoléon I to the present.

[47] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 231.
[48] *Ibid*., p. 2.

Brosman too identifies the importance of literary sources which involve the 'deliberate shaping of historical material in the modes of imaginative discourse'.[49] Moreover, Brosman again provides a foundation for Lloyd with a reserved acknowledgment of the importance of Hayden White: 'one need not agree with Hayden White and others of his persuasion to see that both fiction and written history, by their normally linear construction, their concern with what happens in time, and their modes of discourse and rhetoric, have much in common; even their respective epistemological status, while different in the purest examples, tend to bleed into the other'.[50]

The concept that there are different ways of relating the past to the present, and that some are more worthwhile than others, raises further important points for this thesis. Firstly, just as truth can be discursively constructed in different communicative forms, which affects their value as tools to access the past, so too can the form of novels affect their ability to transmit a worthwhile picture of the past. It is therefore vital not to ascribe all novels equal historical value. To fulfil an historical role they must have been written from a perspective of knowledge about the events and situations portrayed, and have a style which does these factors justice. It is only with these features that novels can achieve an historical veracity; this is by no means the case in terms of many of the war novels written over the last sixty-five years. One such example is Boris Arnold's 1956 *Les Amours dissidentes*.[51] The story recounts the homosexual awakening from schooldays to the early twenties of Maurice Maurel, who is the first-person narrator of the novel.

[49] Catherine Savage Brosman, *Visions of France: Fiction, Art, Ideology* (Baton Rouge, LA: Lousiana State University Press, 1999), p. xiii.
[50] Brosman, *Visions of France*, p. xxi.
[51] Boris Arnold, *Les Amours dissidentes* (Paris: Prima-Union, 1956).

Maurel outlines a series of adventures which he enjoys in his early twenties with German officers during the Occupation. Due to his connections with the Germans, Maurel is asked for many favours by compatriots, some of which could count as acts of resistance: for example, securing the release of British detainees. However, despite this promising storyline, the novel makes little effort to address ethical issues, evoking instead a gay fantasy world which by its nature excludes and ignores the grimmer realities of life under the Occupation.

However, even works such as *Les Amours dissidentes*, or other poorly-written or researched novels still cast a light on relevant issues. This is not simply because audiences do not always choose to read novels that are well-written accurate portrayals, but because all novels respond in some way to the broad historical truths of the war. Even anti-Semitic writers such as Céline, or those who choose to glorify the actions of the *Legion des Volontaires Français* and the SS Charlemagne division, such as Saint-Loup, have to accept the over-arching 'storyline' of the war, no matter what the focus of their portrayal. To illustrate this, this thesis has uncovered no novels based on the ludicrous precept of Holocaust denial. If such a novel were to appear, it would be roundly refused by the public because its content would be rejected, historically and morally. Other authors, such as Robert Harris, illustrate the historical knowledge of society with books such as *Fatherland* (released in French in 1996). Based on the counterfactual premise that Germany won the war, *Fatherland* requires little contextualisation, as the reading public are well aware that such works are based on a 'what if' scenario.[52]

[52] Robert Harris, *Fatherland* trans. Hubert Galle (Paris: Pocket, 1996). There is a large genre of counterfactual novels on the Second World War.

However, the function of novels is not limited to their ability to relate a true past, for as in any study of memory it is important to recognise not only what happened, but what people believed happened. In this, Lloyd is again useful, indicating the role myth plays as an historical phenomenon.[53] Although myths can be seen as widely-held but false beliefs, in history their operation is not so simple. In terms of the war, myths are seldom based on whole untruths, as complete lies would be impossible to maintain; thus any credible myth must contain at least some reality. As Rousso points out, de Gaulle's resistance myth involved downplaying the role of the Vichy government and other collaborators whilst highlighting the exploits of the Resistance, an exercise which was one of emphasis rather than active deceit. No matter how collaboration may be downplayed or glossed over, the Resistance were involved in heroic activity in France during the war, and this is not a false belief. Thus history, in particular with reference to historical events proximal to the time of study, must take heed not only of historical facts, but also attempt to understand why myths exist. In these terms myths, memory and history are inter-connected, all having played (and playing) a part in the battle for control of public understanding of the past - and novels are tools which can both influence and be influenced by all three.

A further work closely related to this thesis's scope is Yan Hamel's 2006 *La Bataille des mémoires – la Seconde Guerre mondiale et le roman français*. Recognising that the Second World War was not only one of the most traumatic experiences in Europe during the twentieth century, Hamel also elucidates that it was (and is) also the most commented upon, with all its aspects regularly and

[53] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 6.

continually put into fictional narrative form (it should be noted that this is mirrored in 'factual' forms, with the subject continuing to provide material for countless histories, biographies, and documentaries). For Hamel, his study is a necessary one because many of the greatest contemporary writers of the period that he examines (from the end of the war to the present day) have tried through their work to make sense of a conflict which contained so much that was without sense. Through their work he provides a study of the fundamental issues they raise, examining how literature deals with a tragedy like no other before, relating issues such as war, death and oblivion. Within this overall approach, Hamel also highlights a number of other formal and ideological points useful to this thesis. Moreover, his study also examines the role of the author, questioning whether authors can remain separate from the dramas of their time, a question of particular importance to this thesis given its period of reference.

By understanding the various ways in which the war has been represented by different groups (historians, journalists, sociologists, politicians, lawyers, writers, dramatists, film-makers), Hamel notes that they have 'tous contribué à produire un ensemble de représentations hétérogènes et multiformes'.[54] This is important for his approach; despite his focus on novels, he acknowledges the problems of any study of collective memory based on the single one of these forms of representation. Continuing, he realises that these forms communally produce an 'ensemble': a collective memory in which the individual is lost. This is a problem that novels can rectify, as they restore the individual to prominence, constructing a hybrid view of

[54] Hamel, *La Bataille des mémoires*, p. 11.

the past that represents both collective and individual memory capable of representing multiple memories.[55]

In terms of even greater relevance to this thesis, Michael L. Berkvam's work from 2000, *Writing the Story of France in World War II – Literature and Memory 1942-1958*, is directly interested in the wider field in which this thesis sits, questioning as it does Rousso's theory by examining Gaullist myths of France which saw the majority of the population involved in, or supportive of, resistance against the occupying forces, with only a handful of individuals involved in collaboration, in novels between 1944 and 1958. Upon initial inspection, this would seem to cover much the same ground as this thesis; the major difference is that this work covers a greater timescale (until 1974) and is focused on collaboration, rather than novels which examine France's general experience during the war. Indeed, the questions which Berkvam asks would seem to support this view. The overall aim of his work is to show that neither outright condemnation of Vichy nor celebration of de Gaulle existed within popular novels of the period. This therefore questions Rousso's hypothesis, as the popular novels Berkvam studies pre-date the later cultural events Rousso identifies as the first to question the Gaullist myth.

A major part of Berkvam's work is devoted to recounting the plots of novels, necessary to inform readers of his work who have not read the novels in question of their content. However, although this is a starting point for further examination and questioning the theory of the Gaullist dominance of memory to 1958, it requires expansion. Rousso's study is barely mentioned within the main body of the work

[55] Hamel, *La Bataille des mémoires,* pp. 11-35.

which examines the novels, and where Rousso is referred to it is in very general terms. Moreover, and critically, despite the work claiming to study literature and memory in its subtitle, the work contains little examination or definition of memory and its issues as a term in a study of this nature. In the sense that Berkvam does little more than examine what kind of war the writers he selects are describing, his work can mainly be seen as a more focused examination on the French novels of his period than the wide-ranging study of novels on the war by Frederick J. Harris in his 1983 *Encounters with Darkness – French and German Writers on World War II*, a work which takes a similarly broadly descriptive approach.

Alan Morris's 1992 *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed: Writers and the "Mode Rétro" in Post-Gaullist France* has similarly close links to Rousso's schema, examining the post-1968 texts that are the focus of the works specific to the period of interest. However, in contrast to Berkvam, Morris examines the literary and historical context of his chosen field of narratives of *la mode rétro* (for Morris, the renewal of interest in and extensive reappraisal of the Occupation), in a manner which places them fully within historical context. Importantly, Morris makes observations on the nature of myth and history with relevance to fictive works important to this thesis. Firstly, he makes the differentiation implicit in the studies already discussed: namely that there are two 'pasts' which should be considered when examining understanding of France's wartime story. These are concerned with what people believed happened during the war ('partial re-presentations of these phenomena by the post-war myth-makers'), and what

actually happened ('the real, wartime phenomena').[56] Secondly, Morris recognises the difficulty in utilizing the concept of myth, realising there is much discussion about what actually constitutes a myth, although there may be agreement that a variety of types can exist. Thus Morris makes clear from the start the contrasts and comparisons between two specific forms of myth with which he wishes to engage:

> I myself shall refer to two different kinds of myth: collective and personal. What I call a collective myth will be a partial view of history which, for one reason or another, is formed in the consciousness of a whole nation, and is accepted by most members of that nation. By a personal myth, I shall mean a unique version of past events, a fabrication to serve therapeutic ends, meaningful mainly to an individual anxious to escape the reality of his or her position. Such differentiation of two types of myth may, at first glance, appear somewhat confusing, but this is not really the case: ultimately, as will be shown, there is only one process of mythification involved, for the personal myths will arise as specific counters to the collective myth which developed round the Resistance. They will, in other words, embody both the phenomenon that I shall call demythification (the destruction of an existing myth) and that which I shall term countermythification (demythification by the use of another myth, frequently the exact opposite of the original one).[57]

Morris sees these two types of myth as important for the study of the *mode rétro*, and his discussions of this period's narratives are framed through this understanding.

Although Morris examines writers who described collaboration before this date, and acknowledges their having established a 'countermyth' that could be used by the post-1968 writers, he sees their influence as limited and unable to challenge the Gaullist cultural hegemony, a view shared by other writers such as Debarati

---

[56] Alan Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed – Writers and the "Mode Rétro" in Post-Gaullist France* (Oxford: Berg, 1992), p. 3.
[57] *Ibid*., p. 2.

Sanyal.[58] It was therefore the case that only after 1968 was this view challenged by a series of writers, such as Pascal Jardin, Marie Chaix and Evelyn Le Garrec, whose work gained attention and employed personal myths to first undermine the Gaullist view of the past, and then replace it through a 'countermythification' which attempted to explain and understand collaboration.[59] This process involved not only comparing many of the Resistance's unsavoury activities with those of collaborators, but also by representing collaborators in an ambiguous or even favourable light. Thus, the Gaullist collective myth was undermined by personal myth, in turn creating a new collective myth which denigrates the memory of the Resistance and negates the actions of all but the most infamous collaborators.[60]

This analysis of the *mode rétro*, both in content and its approach to novels, has much to commend it. However, it can be complemented by a study of narratives which challenge the Gaullist myth prior to the post-1968 period. This is because Morris (following Rousso's lead) studies the narratives of his chosen period with the assumption that, during the preceding decades, any other understanding of the war had been overwhelmed by the Resistance myth. During the *épuration* 'countless novels provided so many orthodox interpretations of events that anything that went against the tide sank in the swell', whilst during the 1950s, 'the longer the decade went on, the more and more exalted the Resistance became within the nation', with de Gaulle's return to power in 1958 seeing his views legitimised for a

[58] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, pp. 35-36. Debarati Sanyal, 'The French War', in Marina MacKay (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 92-93.
[59] For Pascal Jardin and Marie Chaix see chapter six.
[60] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 179.

second time.[61] According to Morris, by 1969, views of the war years had changed little since 1945.[62] This is an important point, due to its repetition in other works which present a simplified version of Morris's argument. One such is Brosman's *Visions of War in France*, which sees that the literature of the period was generally unable to meet the challenge of representingthe Second World War, showing a lack of ability to deal with historical events, and that 'dozens of novels, films, *témoignages*, and historical reconstructions revealed a tendency that has not yet disappeared more than fifty years after the war's end- that of mythifying the defeat, the Free French, the Occupation, or the Resistance – a tendency that in turn has produced the effort to demythify'.[63]

Research Context and Methodology

Morris and those who followed him therefore base their discussion of the post-war period and *mode rétro* on a view of representation of the past that dismisses the efficacy of novels about collaboration to influence and reflect the opinion of their readership during the period prior to that of the *mode rétro*. Morris believes them to be a small minority of the novels produced which discussed the war, and that they were also subject to an underlying assumption that any text which rehabilitated collaboration in any way was therefore a 'bad' text.[64] This is not to claim that Morris ignores writers that examine collaboration and challenge the Gaullist view

[61] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 20, 27, 31. Morris is not alone in basing his assumptions on Rousso's schema. For example, Philippe Buton, in his article on the changing landscape of Rousso's views such as French memory on the Occupation, Liberation, and the Purges, saw that in the immediate aftermath of the war, recollections of defeat and collaboration were 'erased', with a 'rose-tinted' view of the war, fostered by the Gaullists and Communists becoming dominant. See Philippe Buton, 'Occupation, Liberation and Purge' in Andrew Knapp (ed.), *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation 1944-47* (New York: Palgrave, 2007), p. 238.
[62] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 35.
[63] Brosman, *Visions of France*, p. 181. Brosman neither cites Rousso or Morris, nor are they included in the bibliography, although her work clearly mirrors and provides a précis of their arguments.
[64] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 24.

prior to 1968, as he does devote discussion to them.[65] However, by increasing the emphasis on this period and developing further Morris'examination of this period, it is possible that a different picture can emerge. This approach thus complements Morris' work by reassessing his initial postulation about novels on the war in the period between 1944 and 1968 on which his work on the literary narratives of the *mode rétro* is based.

This analysis of Morris' work goes some way towards justifying the chosen period of study from c.1944 to c. 1974, for it identifies a lacuna in the field of existing study – which, whilst acknowledged by authors already mentioned, such as Atack, Lloyd, as well Kathryn Jones, has not yet been satisfactorily filled.[66] Although this may seem a simple argument for the time up until 1968, it should be noted that, by continuing past an 1968 end point, the thesis moves on to a period that has been well examined not only by Morris' more wide-ranging work, but also by many other studies devoted to specific authors.[67] This is, however, a deliberate choice brought about by a wish not only to give background and context to the study of the *mode rétro*, but also to consider earlier phases and their relationship with the *mode rétro*: was it offering a new perspective on collaboration, or did it perhaps instead offer developments to an already-existing understanding of the war years? By including the earliest part of the *mode rétro*, it will be possible to compare and contrast it with previous periods.

---

[65] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, pp. 35-36.
[66] Kathryn N. Jones, *Memories of the Second World War in French and German Literature, 1960-1980* (London: Maney Publishing, 2007), pp. 24-27.
[67] See for example Patrick Modiano. Recent works include John E. Flower (ed.), *Patrick Modiano* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2007 and Annelise Schulte Nordholt, *Perec, Modiano, Raczymow: La Génération d'après et la mémoire de la shoah* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2008).

All the aspects of collaboration contained within the thesis comment on aspects of the periods of political memory identified by Rousso in *Le Syndrome de Vichy*. As Golsan notes, 'there is no doubt that his [Rousso's] division of the memory of the Vichy period into a series of distinct phases is not only historically legitimate but remarkably helpful as an analytical tool for contextualising specific events'.[68] Rousso's schema is indeed an historically legitimate examination of the Gaullist state-sponsored view of the war which emphasised resistance and downplayed collaboration, and explores key events of memory through that paradigm. Initially, this would seem a somewhat odd choice, for much of Rousso's periodisation focuses on the repression of memories of collaboration up to 1968. Yet whilst Rousso's periods provide a contextualisation through which various forms of collaboration are viewed, the focus is not on the Gaullist view of the past. They are retained instead because they practically identify key memory events which can then be examined (through a different theoretical paradigm than the Gaullist view of the past Rousso identifies) by the use of novels of collaboration written during the various periods. An exploration of collaboration will therefore give a different focus to Rousso's periods whilst using his work to provide a framework which will allow comment on the key memory events within his periodization.

This structure will also benefit from an important new tool that allows the thesis to focus primarily on a small corpus of individual works whilst placing them within the wider field of novels which comment on the war: namely the FRAME (FRAnce

[68] Richard J. Golsan, 'The Legacy of World War II in France: Mapping the Discourses of Memory', in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), p. 75.

roMan guErre) database.[69] The FRAME database is one of the major outcomes of the Arts and Humanities Research Council project 'Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939 to the present: Cultural Production and Narrative Identity', which has undertaken a systematic and comprehensive critical re-examination of the historiographical and literary assumptions underpinning current approaches to the narratives of war and occupation in French fiction since 1939, in order to reappraise the nature and function of these narratives in post-war French literary and cultural history. By creating a bibliographical and thematic electronic database of fiction and related writings (totalling 1,956 works), the project has facilitated the realisation of its aims by allowing a study to be conducted not only of well-know novels that deal with the war, but also of many hundreds of forgotten and neglected novels - as well as also creating a tool of lasting value to scholars, permitting further study in themes examined in and related to this thesis. This can be achieved by using the powerful analytical capacity of the database to produce detailed thematic mapping of the chronological development of representations of Vichy, the Occupation and the war years across the six and half decades since 1939, and test conventional periodisations of this material. At a practical level, the database is most useful as a search facility. The database contains an extensive list of over 400 keywords covering all aspects (cultural, military, political, psychological, and social) of the representation of collaboration, both those pertinent to contemporary or near-contemporary representations, and those in more recent decades when issues of memory and historiography are frequently to the fore. Moreover, the search facility has been designed to allow

[69] Available at http://www.frame.leeds.ac.uk/database/

multiple combinations of searches by keyword, synopsis, year of publication and author gender.

To this end, it is an invaluable tool to both select works to be studies, but also to place them within the wider corpus. This enables specific works to be judged against others to see how typical their representation of collaboration is. Additionally, brief biographical notes on the author, where possible, are provided within the database, allowing background information to be gathered, as well as other pertinent information that could be of use (for example, if the novel has been used as the basis for a film). Therefore, as may be apparent, this doctoral research project on representations of collaboration, through sustained analysis of the periods chosen for study and related topics crucial to current historiographical and literary historical readings, makes clear use of the FRAME database, and is suggestive of further work which can be undertaken in the field. However, on a final note, it should also be acknowledged that even with a research tool such as the FRAME database to assist in the selection of works for study, the observation of Susan Suleiman on the choice of novels for study continues to be germane: selection cannot help but remain 'a combination of personal preference, professional intuition and pure chance, which, despite all efforts at objective justification, presides over any activity that has literature as its object'.[70]

With Suleiman's words in mind, novels have therefore been selected to illustrate that medium as a viable tool through which collaboration (and more widely, the

---

[70] Susan Rubin Suleiman, *Authoritarian Fictions: The Ideological Novel as a Literary Genre* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 17.

Occupation) can be examined, and illustrate the broad types of collaboration which took place during the war. They are subject to analyses in chapters three through six. Due to the exceptionally large potential corpus and desirability of making the project manageable, appropriate periods are to be examined in conjunction with one of the four broad areas through which collaboration and its memory can be examined, namely: collaboration and daily life, intellectual and cultural collaboration, military and paramilitary collaboration, and familial memory of collaboration and the *mode rétro*. These areas are discussed in turn with periods which have been chosen to most appropriately develop the work conducted by Rousso and his examination of memory in the period, as well as those who have based their work on literature on his findings.

The thesis is divided into six chapters. This introduction, followed by chapters one and two, deal with background and methodological issues. These will provide context for the four following chapters, which examine different types of collaboration and the representation of them that that novels provide. Finally, the conclusion will synthesize the latter four chapters and consider overall outcomes against the research questions.

Chapter one will provide a brief overview of the history of collaboration in France during the Second World War. Through this, a definition of collaboration will be provided, as well as a discussion of the development of the meaning of collaboration in the socio-political context during and after the war. This chapter will then examine the characteristics of collaboration. Having provided a relevant historical background, the second chapter will examine genre and historiography,

and in particular the differences and similarities that exist within historiography, autobiography and fiction. For this purpose, an examination will be conducted as to how novels and memoirs connect to history writing, showing how narratives represent and give an understanding of past events, illustrating that whilst history, autobiography and fiction remain broadly distinct, their coverage and techniques overlap in many areas, illustrating that they share many of the same facets.

Following the chapters that establish the methodological and historical background, the thesis turns to chapters which examine novels that provide representations of collaboration. Whilst the chapters focus primarily on a select corpus of novels, others are examined where necessary. Chapter three provides a discussion on novels which contain examples of collaboration in daily life (Marcel Aymé's *Le Chemin des écoliers*, Jean-Louis Bory's *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, Jean-Louis Curtis's *Les Forêts de la nuit* and Jean Dutourd's *Au Bon Beurre*) focusing on the period 1944 to 1954. This is the period Rousso labelled *le deuil inachevé*, during which France allegedly failed to come to terms with much of its wartime past. Collaboration in daily life in novels, which presented familiar themes and situations to the post-war population, is used to see if there was indeed a prevalent picture of life that fails to present important aspects of the war.[71] Next, the following two chapters deal with the period that Rousso identified as that of *le refoulement*. Chapter four examines novels which detail intellectual and cultural collaboration, and which were written between 1954 and 1964, and will examine Louis-Ferdinand Céline's trilogy of novels *D'un Château l'autre*, *Nord* and *Rigadon*. This focus is adopted to test whether these novels reflect the official

[71] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 75-76.

political desire in this period to forget the quarrels of the war years, or whether it is possible to see these divisions freshly represented.[72]

After 1964, the Gaullist view moved from exorcising the past to attempting to bestow an '*honneur inventé*' on France which would emphasise a new grandeur.[73] As military collaboration was the antithesis of this, chapter five focuses on military and paramilitary collaboration written between 1964 and 1970, namely Saint-Loup's 1967 *Les Hérétiques*, Patrick Modiano's 1969 *La Ronde de Nuit* and Michel Tournier's 1970 *Le Roi des Aulnes*, to examine whether an alternative version to the Gaullist view was readily available. Chapter six examines the novels *Les Lauriers du Lac de Constance* by Marie Chaix, *La Guerre à neuf ans*, by Pascal Jardin, and Patrick Modiano's *Les Boulevards de ceinture,* which all focus on family memory and collaboration and were written between 1970 and 1974. This chapter does mirror the focus of Rousso's schema in this period, but examines these novels in a way which questions whether the wartime past they detail is in fact present in the novels previously discussed, and whether they offer a new outlook on the war years.[74] Finally, the conclusion will provide an overview of what these narratives of collaboration show about representation of the war, and illustrate how they show that the period 1944 to 1970 was not one of overall repression of France's wartime past, but was instead a development of these themes. Moreover, whilst specific periods have been contrasted with certain types of collaboration which most suitably question them, the conclusion will provide a more general overview of all types of collaboration over the period examined by this thesis to show that

[72] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 77 - 78.
[73] *Ibid*., pp. 100 - 101.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 153 - 154.

individual chapters, whilst examining specific types of collaboration, are not unrepresentative of general representations of collaboration.

To ensure that the selected novels are as representative as possible, a dual approach has been adopted. Firstly, the thesis has followed those such as William Cloonan who have used, wherever possible, novels that were popular or well-known, as these would have been those that the public was most aware of, providing 'a valued repository of insight and intelligence'.[75] Secondly, through the wider information contained in the database, the thesis places these works in the broader context of works from the periods under consideration, allowing broader conclusions to be drawn whilst this select body of works is examined. This therefore takes note of Suleiman's rule that 'a textual approach that pays close attention to individual works should prove illuminating about more than individual works' whilst at the same time benefiting from a wider corpus.[76] Additionally, the conclusion will present a panorama of all types of collaboration within all periods (again utilising the database) to ensure that whilst a generic periodic approach is adopted, broader trends can be seen which will in turn extend both the conclusions found by those works which examine literature and memory, and provide comment on the wider field of French memory of the Second World War.

[75] Cloonan, *The Writing of War*, p. 161.
[76] Susan Rubin Suleiman, *Crises of memory and the Second World War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 9.

Chapter One: The Perception and the Characteristics of Collaboration

Collaboration has not remained a static concept. As the focus of this thesis is a study of narratives of collaboration in post-war France over a wide timeframe, it is necessary to define not only what is meant by collaborators and collaboration, but also to consider the socio-political development of the term, which will assist in contextualising the narratives under consideration. In its simplest form, and at a superficial level, collaboration can be described within this context as co-operation with Germans. However, due to the complexity of the period this definition immediately becomes inadequate, ignoring as it does varying types of collaboration, degrees to which those involved played a part, and motivation. Whilst there are clearly recognisable cases of both collaboration, such as the actions of Pierre Laval, and of resistance, such as the activities of Marc Bloch, that exist at either ends of a wide spectrum, with participants easily termed collaborators or resistants, defining activities that do not clearly belong to either extreme (or that contain aspects of both) can be difficult, and must be carried out with care.[77]

Philippe Burrin has provided a solution to this problem through his suggestion that the term 'accommodation' be used for activities carried out by the majority of the population that do not fit easily into either category. This understanding defines a

[77] Laval served in the Vichy Regime first as *vice-président du conseil* and secrétaire aux affaires étrangères from June to December 1940, then as *Chef de gouvernement* from April 1942 to August 1944, worked closely with the Germans on a variety of projects, including the deportation of Jews to the death camps. He was arrested, found guilty of high treason, and executed by firing squad at the end of the war. For descriptions of the wartime activities of Laval see Jean-Paul Cointet *Pierre Laval* (Paris: Fayard, 1993). Marc Bloch was a noted historian who served in the army in both World Wars. His patriotism, identification with his Jewish roots, and conception of France as champion of liberty, led to his joining the Resistance. His death at the hands of a German firing squad in 1944 has led to his reputation as a national martyr. For details see Olivier Dumoulin, *Marc Bloch* (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2000).

difference between accommodation necessary to maintain day-to-day existence, and provide services required by the public, and voluntary accommodation, in which the French took initiatives of their own to work with the occupiers, for a variety of motives, such as defence of professional interest, or pure selfishness or greed, which illustrated a desire for closer ties or active agreements. To this second group can be added a further sub-group, whose engagement in accommodation was motivated by political calculation. Those who supported this view, either enthusiastically or through resignation to the situation in which they found themselves, believed the Germans represented their best future interests, and engaged in activities ranging from declared support for a policy of *entente*, to enrolling in the occupiers' forces and wearing German uniform. Within this sub-group a certain measure of ideological connivance was necessary.[78] This, as Julian Jackson has noted, is a helpful classification, although Jackson makes the equally valid point that this risks abandoning collaboration as a concept, or at least applying it to a very small group, with the majority simply involved in activities which could be described as accommodation.[79] Therefore, it can be seen that such a schema fragments the history of the Occupation, dividing collaboration into a large group of 'accommodators' and a small faction of collaborators.

Jonathan Judaken has provided a more refined solution to this problem in his work on the cultural elites of the war years. Within this, Judaken notes that the historiography of the period is still struggling to deal with the significance of different types of actions under Vichy. Whilst noting the degrees of accommodation

[78] Philippe Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande* (Paris, Seuil, 1995), pp. 468-70.
[79] Julian Jackson, *France: The Dark Year, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 243.

suggested by Burrin, Judaken suggests a 'broad vocabulary for the spectrum of choices that individuals made' can be used to examine cultural and intellectual collaboration, and offers a set of terms he has named 'choices on the C-Curve'.[80] Whilst Judaken's primary focus is intellectual and cultural collaboration, these provide a useful categorisation through which all collaboration can be understood:

> The range includes *commitment* (in the sense of organised resistance, but also active opposition); *connivance* against the enemy by turning a blind-eye to resistance activity or opposing the authorities through veiled or coded messages; *circumspection* of the Germans and their institutions; *cohabitation* with the occupying authorities or what the French often call *attentisme* (a wait-and-see attitude); *concessions* in order to continue to work to survive; *compliance* by conforming or acquiescing to German rules and regulations; *complicity* by active participation in German endeavours or initiatives; *conviction* in aspects of the redemptive politics of the National Revolution or National Socialism; *collaboration* with the Germans by the Vichy authorities; and *collaborationism* (i.e. commitment to fascist or Nazi ideology).[81]

To this, Judaken adds four factors to be considered when these concepts are applied: time, place, social position, and strictures upon individuals. To illustrate time and place, it is noted that the world looked very different in the summer of 1940 than November 1942, and that experiences of the war would be different between places such as Paris, Clermont-Ferrand and Alsace and Lorraine (due to the division of the country, there were different legal and administrative regimes which controlled these different areas at different times). The differences in place and time can be seen in Joseph Joffo's *Un sac de billes*, an autobiographical novel which narrates the flight of two Jewish boys from Paris through the south of France, to Savoie, as they attempt to avoid arrest and deportation by the

[80] Jonathan Judaken, 'Intellectuals, Culture, and the Vichy Years: Reappraisals and New Perspectives', *Contemporary French Civilization*, 31 (2007), p. 84.
[81] *Ibid*., p. 84.

authorities.[82] Set between 1941 and 1945 across Paris and the south of France, the novel illustrates the differing conditions within which those who wished to capture them operated, and the importance of factors such as the demarcation line to the forms collaboration could take: the boys initially escape occupied Paris for the relative safety of the unoccupied zone.

The difference that social position made to individuals was also important. This point is made forcefully, if somewhat one-dimensionally and certainly unfairly, in Roger Boussinot's *Aérodrome*, which portrays life under the Occupation from a communist-dominated viewpoint, with the bourgeoisie preferring Hitler's dominance to the power of the people.[83] *Aérodrome* portrays the bourgeoisie as having betrayed France in 1940, and continuing to do so under the Occupation. For example, during the Occupation, trafficking with the German *Bureau d'achats* in Bordeaux is carried out by the wealthy and anti-semitic Count. Beyond matters of wealth, experiences which delineated the bourgeoisie from the working classes could be said to vary with other factors, as the experiences at different times of Jews, Protestants, Freemasons and Communists illustrate.[84] One such instance is Marcel Bourrette's *Tout renaîtra*, which examines the importance of religion under the Occupation.[85] Within this novel, sympathy to Pétain is seen as being a Roman Catholic trait, whilst hostility to Protestants is shown by the regional head of the *Légion des Volontaires Français*.

[82] Joseph Joffo, *Un sac de billes* (Paris: Jean-Claude Lattès, 1973).
[83] Roger Boussinot, *Aérodrome* (Paris: Editeurs Français Réunis, 1954).
[84] Judaken 'Intellectuals, Culture, and the Vichy Years', pp. 84-85.
[85] Marcel Bourrette, *Tout renaîtra* (La Tronche-Montfleury (Isère): Editions des Cahiers de l'Alpe, 1959).

This discussion about the wider definition of collaboration indicates the near impossibility of providing a static classification to be universally applied to judge specific acts. However, it should also be noted that this problem, which Judaken explains, also provides further justification of the use of novels as a tool through which collaboration can be understood. Their ability to comment on and reflect myriad individuals and situations, and to explore the motivations of those involved in collaboration, means that they can be used as exemplars for Judaken's model. Moreover, whilst Judaken's model appeared in 2007, novels that contain collaboration have been exploring these different aspects since the war.

To provide further contextualisation for the novels contained in this thesis, the nature of the concept of collaboration must also be discussed in its post-war context. Just as the nature of collaboration changed during the war, so too has the understanding of it morphed since, with development of the connotations of the expression taking place. This chapter will examine how collaborators have been perceived, represented and judged up to the 1970s through the legal definition of the term, before the characteristics of the individuals and groups are considered. Moreover, this discussion of the perception and distinguishing features of the term will also provide a guide to their understanding of collaboration, allowing the conclusion to determine whether such comprehensions of collaboration are similar to those in contemporary novels, or whether such novels offer an alternative picture of collaboration.

Judgment of Collaboration: The Politico-Legal Development of the Term

The legal framework and concepts under which collaborators were to be identified and tried were established by the Free French in exile. Although de Gaulle had always condemned those who agreed to the Armistice of 1940 as traitors, it was the *Comité Français de Libération Nationale* (CFLN) based in Algiers which from 1943 began to consider what actions against collaborators would be necessary with the liberation of France. This was carried out under the auspices of de Gaulle, who in August of that year made it clear that the judging of collaborators was to be an affair of state and not one that was to give way to personal and local battles.[86] The CFLN committed itself to the punishment of Pétain, his ministers and those subordinates who had been responsible for actions of collaboration.[87] This process was given a 'trial run' when the first member of Pétain's government, the former *secrétaire d'État à l'Intérieur* Pierre Pucheu (who had travelled to North Africa under a pass of safe conduct) was tried before a military court and shot in Algiers in March 1944.[88] A technocrat who served from July 1941 to April 1942, he was removed from office at the insistence of the Germans,[89] but only after he had allegedly been involved in the selection of French hostages for execution by the Germans.[90] Following his dismissal he settled in Vichy-controlled Algeria; after Algeria was taken over by the Free French, Purcheu was captured, and his execution was seen as deterring further collaboration in France. Purcheu's was the

[86] Novick, *The Resistance Versus Vichy*, p. 49.
[87] *Ibid.,* p. 51.
[88] Dominique Venner, *Histoire de la collaboration* (Paris: Pygmalion, 2002), pp. 406-410.
[89] M. Curtis, *Verdict on Vichy Verdict on Vichy – Power and Prejudice in the Vichy France Regime* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002), p. 79.
[90] Cointet, *Expier Vichy,*pp. 67-68.

first major trial and execution to take place under de Gaulle's jurisdiction, and was symbolic of the judgements major collaborators could expect to receive.[91]

It was a guiding principle of the Free French that Vichy was not the legitimate government of France. The CFLN referred to the 'de facto authority' when discussing Pétain and his government, and the official line was that upon liberation, Vichy and all its acts were to be removed from history: in effect, time had stopped at the collapse of France and the Armistice in 1940. This understanding of the events of this period required that the precise details of Pétain's rise to power were not too closely examined. Whilst President Albert Lebrun's invitation to Pétain to form a government on 16 June 1940 marked the official point at which time 'stopped', in reality it can be convincingly argued that Pétain's appointment was perfectly legal.[92] The views of the CFLN, however, fitted with the views of wider resistance organizations, who wished for a *renouvellement* in French political life that would wipe away not only Vichy but also those who had voted in the National Assembly to end the Third Republic on 10 July 1940. This vote was an overwhelming one; on 9 July, the Chamber of Deputies and Senate both accepted almost unanimously the principle of constitutional change (voting 393-3 and 299-1 respectively for change), and when the two chambers met the following day together as the National Assembly they voted full legislative powers to Pétain, as well as power to draft a new constitution, by an overwhelming 569-80.[93] Again, a case can be made for the vote of 10 July being legal, and it is clear that both the Armistice and regime change brought about by the vote were accepted by a

[91] Venner, *Histoire de la collaboration*, p. 406-410.
[92] Paxton, *Vichy France*, pp. 330-31.
[93] Novick, *Resistance versus Vichy*, p. 5.

majority of the population.[94] Despite this, the men of Vichy who allowed its birth (and some who went on to willingly serve it) can be seen as displaying some of the earliest examples of collaboration. They were high-profile figures, who betrayed France to the Germans, and whom both the CFLN and wider resistance wished to bar from future public life.[95]

Yet what were the legal terms under which they were to be tried? Assuming all acts of the 'de facto' government from 16 June 1940, when Pétain took office, were illegal, and therefore the Armistice itself was unlawful and France had never in fact ceased to be at war with Germany, it was considered by Gaullist and other resistance groups that crimes of collaboration could be tried under the existing penal code; this view was shared by the CFLN. Indeed, the French Penal Code had been widened to cater for war in 1939, so most acts of collaboration could be prosecuted under its provisions. Under these, furnishing men or materials to the enemy, enrolment in enemy-organized or subsidized groups, propaganda in favour of enemy activities, acts harmful to the French state of the freedom of its citizens and acts which were intended to demoralize the population were all deemed crimes. These were backed up by an article which made illegal 'intelligence with the enemy with a view to favouring his endeavours'.[96]

Yet the CFLN felt some articles required clarification in terms of interpreting how to deal with the war. Thus, handing over or informing on members of the Resistance or others wanted by Vichy or the Germans was to be considered harmful

[94] Marie Flonneau, 'L'évolution de l'opinion publique de 1940 à 1944', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992), p. 507.
[95] For a discussion of the legitimacy and legality of Vichy see Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, pp. 191-197. The Gaullist's believed that all actions from 16 June 1940 lacked legal authority.
[96] Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, p. 143.

to national defence, and any acts committed against those allied to France (or, more clearly, the CFLN carrying on the war in the name of France) were also deemed criminal. Additionally, as Vichy was not considered a legal government, it could not offer those who had worked immunity for carrying out the orders of superiors. Laws such as these gave a clear indication of actions that were considered collaborationist. However, it was felt that this very legalistic judgment was too rigid to consider the moralistic verdicts required, and would consider a few definite high-profile cases in a harsh manner and leave any lesser men free to participate in what was supposed to be a new dawn. With this in mind, de Gaulle created a selective form of justice, which would not implicate wider society, and take into account the necessities of the Occupation.[97] Indeed, Vichy's own repressive measures against dissidents, such as the authorization in September 1940 for prefects to intern anyone deemed a danger to national security, meant many would have accepted the regime for fear of reprisal.[98] Conversely, the existing code would not take account of those who, for example, had taken part in anti-Semitic agitation, or who had not acted criminally but had failed to oppose the Germans, such as doctors who willingly certified forced labourers as healthy.

Thus, the state of national indignity (which was instituted specifically as a 'state', for although the punishment was retroactive in nature, the government was keen it should not be seen as a retroactive law, despite those who collaborated having, by their actions, come to that 'state' almost regardless of the law) was promulgated on August 26 1944.[99] If guilty, punishment included exclusion from the franchise and

[97] Cointet, *Expier Vichy*, p. 160.
[98] Jackson, *France: The Dark Years,* p. 151.
[99] Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, pp. 146-49.

ineligibility for elected office for established periods of time. As guilt was judged on acts such as having written or lectured in favour of the enemy, collaboration with the enemy, racism or totalitarian doctrines, the effect of national degradation was far-reaching and punished those not guilty of specific acts under the penal code. This would facilitate the cleansing of the French state; it would allow for France to be governed by those who were not tainted by collaboration, with wide-ranging terms allowing those in positions of influence during the war, and those who served them, to be the focus of this. It would also establish the initial legal meaning of collaboration at the end of the war.[100]

Yet it is important to question how practical application worked after liberation, and what effect it had on the official use of the term 'collaborator'. Despite the thought given to the process by which collaborators were to be punished, and de Gaulle's determination that the process should be carried out according to law, there was, at the end and in the immediate aftermath of the Occupation, some 'illegal' activity where vengeance was sought. In addition, moral judgment alone was used to condemn and punish: the shaving of the heads of women who were regarded as having fraternized with enemy soldiers being a prime example. For the most part, however, order was maintained with judgment and punishment largely left to official means established by the CNLF, and although at the Liberation some acts of violence were carried out in revenge against collaborators, there was no large-scale and widespread campaign of vengeance.[101] Despite this, some

[100] Although some efforts to remove collaborators were retrograde, they should be compared with the actions of Vichy. For example, to rid the state of undesirables, from 17 July 1940 it was possible for any public servant to be dismissed without formalities (Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 151).

[101] Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, p. 60. Although it is possible to see that those cases where violence did occur may have released enough tensions to ensure later trials were more lenient. As

controversy remains about the process of judgement and punishment at the Liberation, with political ideals used as cover for personal vengeance in many cases of summary justice, as Philippe Bourdel has pointed out.[102]

As has already been stated, the Resistance was in favour of purging public offices of collaborators to bring about a new beginning for France, and whilst in exile or undercover, the groundwork had been laid to make this possible. This, however, did not take account of de Gaulle's pragmatic view of what was necessary for the rebuilding of France, and these views would come to have a powerful influence on who was tried and condemned for collaboration, for whilst there was no question that those who had worked closely with Vichy or the Germans would go unpunished, wholesale cleansing was neither possible nor intended. This practical stance can be witnessed in a statement by de Gaulle of 25 July 1944, discussing the fate of state employees:

> Le gouvernement entend procéder aux éliminations nécessaires… il n'a aucunement l'intention de faire tout à coup table rase de la grande majorité des serviteurs de l'État, dont la plupart, pendant les années terribles de l'occupation et de l'usurpation, ont avant tout cherché à servir de leur mieux la chose publique. Le dénigrement de tels et tels membres ou de telles et telles catégories de l'administration française est une chose facile, mais trop souvent injuste ou exagérée. D'ailleurs, les pouvoirs publics ont les auxiliaires qu'ils méritent et c'est en donnant eux-mêmes l'exemple de la compétence, du désintéressement et du goût des responsabilités qu'ils ont le plus de chances d'être servis comme il faut.[103]

Novick also writes, 'the collaborators who were killed in the first days may have been, like the girls who submitted to the shears, the sacrificial offering that purchased leniency for many of their colleagues'. Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy* p.78. It is estimated that about 10,000 people were killed in the *épuration sauvage* (Jackson, *France: The Dark Years* pp. 578-89).

[102] Philippe Bourdrel, *L'Épuration sauvage, 1944-45* (Paris: Perrin, 2008), p. 647.

[103] Charles de Gaulle, *Mémoires de guerre: L'unité - 1942 – 1944* (Paris: Plon, 1956), p. 584.

This idea can be seen in application with the fate of the upper levels of the civil service. Although some were new appointments, the majority of those in place at the Liberation had been pre-war appointees, and were able to serve the Third Republic, Vichy, and then go on to work for the Fourth Republic with no break in their careers. For example, 98 percent of those active in the *Cour des Comptes*, which audited the public accounts, in 1942 remained employed in 1946. Even the Inspectorate of Finance, over a third of whoses employees actively lent advice to Vichy ministries in policy-making jobs, retained some 97 percent of inspectors general in 1948 that had been active in 1942, illustrating no widespread radical purge.[104] Yet these figures also require the obvious observation that it would have been impossible to work in the upper levels of the civil service during the war years without having 'served Vichy' or 'collaborated with the Germans' to some greater or lesser extent.[105]

Clearly a purge was necessary; in the civil service, for example, it would have been impossible for outspoken supporters of Vichy or those who had worked closely with the Germans to remain in place. Although this rule is applicable to the whole spectrum of French society, another issue which helped shape the legal process and definition of collaborators was that of profile, and this again can be clearly seen in the civil service. Those who had served in high-profile 'political' roles, such as Fernand de Brinon, were made examples of. Appointed Secretary of State in 1942, de Brinon was the third-ranking member of the Vichy regime and an outspoken advocate of collaboration. He was accused of war crimes, found guilty, sentenced to death on 6 March, 1947, and executed on 15

[104] Paxton, *Vichy France*, pp. 335-336.
[105] *Ibid.,* p. 80.

April.[106] De Brinon's fate contrasts with that of those who ran 'technical' departments with much lower profiles and less need of attention. For example, Jérôme Carcopino, who served as Minister of National Education and Youth from February 1941 to 18 April 1942, escaped the Liberation relatively unscathed. Imprisoned in Fresnes in August 1944, he secured his release in February 1945, and was acquitted of charges of collaboration in 1947, going on to be elected to the Académie française in 1955.[107] The issue of profile meant the balance was naturally tilted towards finding those with higher profiles guilty of collaboration. This can be seen as part of the problem which makes attempting to construct any form of consistent jurisprudence impossible, and as Peter Novick has stated 'it seems likely that in most cases a decision was reached "instinctively" (applying the "national indignity" concept), and then formal criteria were adjusted to impose a semblance of system on the [purge] commissions' jurisprudence'.[108]

One of the most flagrant cases within this category was René Bousquet, whose collaboration only came to full light following accusations of crimes against humanity in 1989. Prior to this he had enjoyed a successful post-war career in the civil service and politics. As a civil servant, in September 1941 Bousquet became *préfet* in the Marne *département*. Following this, he was appointed Secrétaire général à la police, a position in which he served from April 1942 to December 1943. As police chief, Bousquet guaranteed the autonomy of the French police, but this was at the price of collaborating with the occupiers, and actively assisting them

[106] William Shirer, *The Collapse of the Third Republic* (London: Heinemann, 1970), p. 366.
[107] For further information on Carcopino's career, see Stéphanie Corcy-Debray, *Jérôme Carcopino, un historien à Vichy* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001).
[108] *Ibid*., p. 89.

in combatting those the Germans saw as enemies (primarily, Jews, Communists and resisters).[109] This police assistance can be readily seen within Roger Boussinot's *Les Guichets du Louvre*, which charts one young man's attempts to intervene and save Jews in the 1942 Paris *Rafle du Vel' d'Hiv*. Whilst the novel details police brutality, it also suggests that many acquiesced in the *rafle* as it was carried out by the French police rather than the occupying forces, indicating the importance of the assistance of the French police.[110] Bousquet had assisted Carl Oberg, head of all German police forces in France (including the SS and Gestapo) in organising the notorious 1942 Paris *rafle*, in addition to the 1943 Marseilles round-up, as well as assisting the occupiers in countless other ways.[111] Whilst it has been noted that his personality was 'intractable for those who seek to penetrate his motives or to generalise from his career about the dilemmas and pitfalls of collaboration', it can be said that, throughout his career, Bousquet worked hard to please whoever his superiors may have been.[112] This may explain his ability to work under the Third Republic, Vichy, and subsequently, after being aquitted of war crimes for his alleged contribution to resistance, the Fourth and Fifth Republics.[113]

Forms of Collaboration

Those in high-profile positions were therefore clear targets due to their visibility and the ease with which they could be prosecuted, as seen by examining the case of

[109] Édouard Husson *Heydrich et la solution finale* (Paris: Perrin, 2012), p. 557.
[110] Roger Boussinot, *Les Guichets du Louvre* (Paris: Denoël, 1960).
[111] For further information, see Claude Lévy and Paul Tillard, *La Grande Rafle du Vel d'Hiv : 16 juillet 1942* (Paris: Tallandier, 2012), and Donna Ryan, *The Holocaust and the Jews of Marseille; The Enforcement of Anti-Semitic Policies in Vichy France* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996).
[112] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 96.
[113] Bousquet became an advocate of left-wing politics in the 1970s, and was a supporter and regular visitor to President François Mitterrand during the earlier 1980s. In 1991 he was indicted for crimes against humanity for his wartime role. In 1993, a few weeks before his trial, Bousquet was shot dead in his apartment. For further information on Bousquet's career, see Pascale Froment *René Bousquet* (Paris: Fayard, 2001).

Robert Brasillach. Brasillach is perhaps still the best-known 'cultural' collaborator due to his politically infused literary output, and for being the most high-profile writer to be executed for his works. He was charged with treason, for collaboration and helping send people to death by publishing the names of those who violated Vichy laws. He had, in addition, worked with the collaborationist bookstore, the *Librairie Rive-Gauche*, as well as for the collaborationist newspaper *Je suis partout*, and with the German Institute in Paris (he was also a virulent anti-Semite, although not charged with offences against or encouraging the deportation of Jews, despite his writings on the subject). His death sentence was controversial, with many of the intellectual community, including François Mauriac and Albert Camus, pleading for clemency.[114] Brasillach was not the only writer to be executed (Paul Chack, for example), and other notable authors such as Henri Béraud, Charles Maurras and George Suarez faced early high-profile trials after the *Comité National des Écrivains*, the Communist-dominated Resistance contact group formed during the war which was to make or break literary reputations in the post-war period, called for rigorous action against collaborationist writers.[115]

When examining the business community, a different picture emerges, with the Renault Company providing the most extreme example of the fate of business collaborators. Economic collaboration, whether through choice or necessity, was widespread, with Renault proving one of the very few examples to be punished. Louis Renault built machinery for the German Army, including tanks, and was willing to manufacture whatever was desired to protect his machine tools, declaring in 1943 'une seule chose compte, moi et mon usine', in relation to the "relève"

[114] Herbert Lottman, *L'Épuration* (Paris, Fayard, 1986), pp. 241-48.
[115] Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, p. 126, p. 162.

scheme, proposing that 'les autres n'ont qu'à faire comme moi!'.[116] Although Renault died before he could stand trial, his nephew by marriage, the Vichy Minister for Industrial Production François Lehideux, who had arranged for the close business contact to aid German's war effort, survived. He was arrested but freed shortly after in 1946, and charges of collaboration were dropped in 1949. He died aged ninety-five in 1998, after commenting in a 1997 interview that 'extenuating circumstances justified Vichy policy'.[117] Although the Renault Company, like some others, was nationalized, this was amongst the more severe punishments handed out to a sector that had done much for the German war effort.

It was, however, more often the case that collaboration in business was overlooked, or that those engaged ensured they could also claim some form of resistance involvement at Liberation. Michelin, for example, made the case that it was faced with the choice of either closing or working with the Germans. By remaining open, the company could show it protected its workers from being conscripted into the *Service du travail obligatoire*.[118] The difficulties and benefits of business collaboration can be seen within Georges Duhamel's *Cri des profondeurs*. This largely first-person novel is a confessional version of the war years of Félix Tallemand. Tallemand, through his position as director of a medical laboratory, takes advantage of his position to work for the Germans, and to buy shares in the business owned by a Jewish associate, Winterberg, whose family perish after being deported. Tallemand profits from the war, and can be seen as detestable and egotistical. However, he avoids retribution at the Liberation as he has hidden and

[116] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, p. 255.
[117] Curtis, *Verdict on Vichy*, p. 269.
[118] Thomas R. Christofferson and Michael S. Christofferson, *France During World War II: From Defeat to Liberation* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2006), p. 189.

saved Winterberg. Moreover, unbeknown to him, some of the laboratory workers had used the cellar as an arms depot, which, when Tallemand discovers it, also facilitates a spurious claim to having supported the Resistance.[119]

However, despite differences between the punishment given to different groups, and de Gaulle's desire for a pragmatic approach necessitated by a need for experienced individuals to rebuild France and a desire for national unity, clear cases were punished in all sections of society.[120] Membership of any of Pétain's cabinets, senior positions in either propaganda services or the *Commissariat général aux questions juives*, having been a member of any collaborationist organization or taken part in meetings or demonstrations, or given lectures or published writings in favour of collaboration all brought investigation and penalties if necessary, giving a legal and conceptual meaning to 'collaboration'.

Soon after the war, perceptions of collaboration began to change, and with these the legal penalties that had been given out in the immediate aftermath of the war. With the return of the right as a political force in the late 1940s and early 1950s (basing its new legitimacy on the battle against *résistantialisme* and the purge, rather than values which stemmed from wartime activity), its members wished to rehabilitate themselves, and, by dint of this, supporters of collaboration and Pétainism who now

[119] Georges Duhamel, *Cri des profondeurs* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1951). The name 'Tallemand' may be symbolic, bringing to mind both 'Allemand' and 'Talleyrand', the revolutionary turncoat.

[120] However, it can be seen that some derisory sentences were given out. René Bousquet for example was only subject to five years of national indignity for his actions, and only a few high-profile figures such as Pétain and Laval were sentenced to death. Moreover, in many such cases the judiciary involved in judging former collaborators had themselves taken an oath of allegiance to Pétain, yet survived into the Fourth Republic. André Mornet, who prosecuted both Pétain and Laval, had during taken the oath to Pétain as head of state, and had served on the committee of denaturalisation which revoked the citizenship of recent immigrants. Paxton, *Vichy France*, p. 340.

shared political ground with them.[121] One such example is Roger de Saivre, Pétain's former *chef-adjoint du cabinet*, who was elected as deputy to the National Assembly in 1951.[122] This led to the first of a series of amnesty laws which were enacted in early 1951.[123] Those who supported amnesty cited clemency, reparation for the injustices of the purge, national reconciliation, the political nature of certain offences committed during the Occupation and the examples of Italy and Germany (which had already embarked on national reconciliation) as the motivating factors. The first law gave amnesty to all those subjected to 'national degradation' and prison sentences of less than fifteen years. This allowed many former collaborators a return to public life. Following this, a second law was passed in 1953, which released from prison all but the most seriously guilty. From 40,000 prisoners for collaboration in 1945, by 1956 (following the 1953 law) only 62 remained, with only 19 in 1958.[124]

It had taken only a decade for most convicted collaborators to return to regular society, with the principle of amnesty requiring institutionalised forgetting of past misdemeanors. Part of this process of reconciliation was a new understanding of collaboration, with a 'good' Vichy existing alongside the 'bad', with some collaborators seen to be acting to protect the French rather than aid the Germans. Indeed, de Gaulle himself had actively participated in the notion that after the Armistice, France needed 'deux cordes à son arc': one in the hands of de Gaulle;

[121] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 75-76.
[122] *Ibid*., p. 56, p. 69.
[123] These amnesties can be seen to be based on the precedent of that of 1880, which pardoned former members of the Paris Commune who had been deported to New Caledonia and allowed them to return to France. Alice Bullard, *Exile to Paradise: Savagery and Civilization in Paris and the South Pacific*, 1790-1900 (Stanford University Press, 2001), p. 239-243.
[124] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 69-71.

the other in the hands of Pétain.[125] This was a tacit admittance that the Pétainist theory of the 'sword and the shield', which had been an unacceptable defence in the immediate aftermath of the war,[126] was now considered a beneficial aid to national unity that could help overcome painful memories of the war years. This can be seen in André François-Poncet's speech to the Académie Française upon his election to Pétain's now-vacant chair. As is customary, François-Poncet gave this on the topic of his predecessor, and vocalised a theory that could be adopted by anyone who wished to move on from the difficult question of wartime allegiances. Expounding the view that Pétain served as France's 'shield', blame for the excesses of collaboration was shifted to Laval, whilst admiration for de Gaulle was expressed.[127] Although collaboration could never be completely forgotten, it could be forgiven in light of this new understanding, which allowed the majority of former collaborators to be supporters of the 'shield' Pétain (and, by implication, the 'sword': de Gaulle), rather than the traitorous Laval.[128]

This attitude towards collaboration remained throughout the 1950s and 1960s, with no new trials taking place; at the same time, the new parties, leaders, programmes and newspapers of the resisters proved more fleeting after the war than would have seemed possible in 1944, with the beginning of the Cold War dividing the Communist Resistance from the other resistance parties, such as the *Mouvement républicain populaire* and *Union démocratique et socialiste de la Résistance*, at a

[125] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy,* p. 53. The metaphor is taken from a reported conversation with de Gaulle.
[126] Paxton, *Vichy France*, p. 153.
[127] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 82–83.
[128] This theory was given historical support by the work of Robert Aron, in his *Histoire de Vichy*, which developed this theme of the sword and shield. For a fuller discussion of this, see chapter one and Robert Aron, *Histoire de Vichy 1940-1944* (Paris: Fayard, 1954).

time when they too were losing their electorates to revived conservative parties.[129] This peace was explosively rocked by Marcel Ophüls' influential 1971 documentary *Le Chagrin et la pitié*, and subsequently shattered by the scandal surrounding the Touvier case. *Le Chagrin et la pitié* interviewed a selection of French and German survivors about daily life in Clermont-Ferrand, supposedly representative of an average city under occupation. Although many wartime inhabitants were interviewed, the most remarkable and original interview was with Christian de la Mazière, a Frenchman who had been a member of the Waffen SS's Charlemagne Division. Instead of playing the role of a politically foolish or simply greedy collaborator, de la Mazière freely admitted that he wished to wear German uniform and supported Nazi aims, thereby illustrating some collaborators had acted out of ideological commitment.[130] This film has been seen as representative of a new way of thinking that had been part of French cultural life since the riots of 1968: dissatisfaction with 'old' society and its social aspects and traditional morality (and one particular area - the education system), and by implication its version of history.

This change in attitudes was evident in the legal field by the public reaction to the pardon granted to Paul Touvier by President Pompidou in November 1971. Touvier, a former member of the Milice (who played an active part in the persecution of both Jews and the Resistance), had been condemned to death in absentia by two courts in 1946 and 1947, but had eluded capture, and in 1967 the

[129] Paxton, *Vichy France*, pp. 331-332.
[130] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 125-126.

statute of limitations took effect, his death sentences lapsing.[131] However, he was still forbidden residence in the twelve departments of south-eastern France and the enjoyment of his property there. Pompidou's pardon eliminated these penalties, and allowed Touvier to return to his home town in the region. Yet Touvier was not a 'presentable' collaborator in the mould of la Mazière, who had served five years in prison for his offences. As a member of the Milice, he had been a member of the extreme wing of French collaboration, and of an organization whose main purpose was to combat and destroy the Resistance. The pardon was given heightened effect as France was simultaneously seeking the extradition of Klaus Barbie, former head of the Lyon German security service, to face trial. Coincidentally, Touvier had also operated in Lyon, and had similar responsibilities to Barbie, allowing the two to become further linked in the public mind. This naturally led to indignant questioning of how the clearly guilty Barbie could face trial, whereas Touvier, convicted of crimes against his own people, was given a presidential pardon.[132]

However much Pompidou may have wished France could continue to draw a veil over the war years within its political narrative, the new environment brought about by the riots of 1968 allowed new questioning by a younger generation; this meant his desire was doomed to fail in light of phenomena such as *Le Chagrin et la pitié.* Inquisitiveness was only heightened by Pompidou's naïve pardoning of Touvier,[133]

---

[131] Touvier's story was used as the basis for Brian Moore's *The Statement* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), which outlined the story of Pierre Brossard, a former collaborator on the run, who relies on his friends and the church to shield him from justice. In 2004, Moore's novel was turned into a film with Sir Michael Caine in the title role (*The Statement*, dir. Norman Jewison, 2004).

[132] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 138–146.

[133] Although de Gaulle did pardon former collaborators, he was more sensible in his approach. In 1966, Jacques Vasseur, who had served with the Gestapo in Angers, was pardoned. This, however, only prevented his execution, and Vasseur remained in prison until 1983. Vasseur himself later became the subject of a novel on the Occupation. See Dominique Jamet, *Un Traître* (Paris: Flammarion, 2008).

and marked the end of the political class's ability to play down the involvement of the French people in acts of collaboration.

With collaboration once more being the focus of public attention, the role of Jewish memory (awakened by crises in the Middle East and the emergence of new forms of anti-Semitism) took a dominant role in attitudes to collaboration. Although the anti-Semitic nature of Vichy had never been denied, and having held a position in the *Commissariat Général Aux Questions Juives* had been a punishable offence, all of those tried in the aftermath of the war who had been found guilty had been charged with war crimes. However, war crimes were subject to the statute of limitations, meaning that anyone tried either in person or in absentia was, after the effect of the statute of limitations in 1967, free from the effects of any judgment against them (in addition, for those not already prosecuted, the expiry of the twenty year time limit had effectively made 1965 the latest possible year anyone could be brought to justice for crimes committed during the war). With this in mind, in 1964 the French National Assembly voted to abolish the statute of limitations for crimes against humanity, meaning all future prosecutions would be pursued as such, altering the focus to crimes committed and shifting the emphasis of the active legal definition of collaboration.[134]

Following the war, Jewish groups had been keen to re-assimilate into French society and had no wish to be considered in any way different to other groups, ensuring no particular emphasis was placed on the fate of the Jews. Playing into the prevailing mood of a desire for national unity, this remained the case throughout the

[134] Nancy Wood, 'Crimes or misdemeanors? Memory on Trial in Contemporary France', *French Cultural Studies* 5 (1994), p. 6.

1950s and 1960s. This changed in 1967, when the French Government's pro-Arab stance caused concern amongst Jewish groups and the wider French public. This was given particular piquancy by a phrase used by de Gaulle when defending the French government's position: 'Certains mêmes redoutaient que les juifs, jusqu'alors dispersés, qui étaient restés ce qu'ils avaient été de tout temps, un peuple d'élite, sûr de lui-même et dominateur, n'en viennent, une fois rassemblés sur le site de leur ancienne grandeur, à changer en ambition ardente et conquérante les souhaits très émouvants qu'ils formaient depuis dix-neuf siècles'.[135]

This representation of Jews, which seemed to require that Jews make a choice between Israel, which had come into being as the world's only Jewish state in 1948 (and which was based on the concept of the Land of Israel as the Jewish homeland, a central concept of Judaism for two thousand years) or France (or even perhaps be secretly loyal to a cause outside of France) naturally brought back painful memories of the war, and brought easy comparison with Vichy policies.[136] The debate around this statement assisted in solidifying Jewish groups opposed to this viewpoint, and was aided by the government's continued pro-Arab policies throughout the 1970s.[137]

The Characteristics of Collaboration

'Qu'est-ce qu'un Collaborateur?' was the enquiring title of a 1945 Jean-Paul Sartre essay, one of the earliest attempts to give definition to a concept which still remains

[135] Quoted in Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 159. The quote is taken from a transcript of a newsreel.
[136] For further discussion and context of this speech, see Jonanthan Fenby, *The General: Charles de Gaulle and the France he Saved* (London: Simon and Schuster, 2010), pp. 554-555.
[137] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 160 - 163.

open to debate.[138] For Sartre, writing in the immediate aftermath of the war, collaborators were a natural phenomenon provided the right conditions were in place, akin to suicides and criminals, and although not all were fascist or pro-German, the majority was prepared to accept Nazi ideology, even if only as a tool to further their own ends. He asserts the majority were drawn from the bourgeoisie (who wished to maintain and develop their position over the proletariat), the higher clergy, and peripheral groups of society who were largely marginalized before the war; together they shared as a denominator an inability to reconcile themselves to the institution of the Republic and the results of the revolutions of 1789, 1830, 1848 and 1871, and saw themselves as being part of (or willing to work with) a new world order within a German-dominated Europe. Those who resisted were clinging to outmoded ideas and realities.[139]

Sartre's essay remains an interesting and influential typology of collaborators, and continues to be worthy of discussion by historians.[140] This is particularly the case as later accounts tend to focus on the collection of extreme Paris-based collaboration groups, or give the traits of collaboration without an explicit description or typology.[141] To some extent, this can be attributed to difficulty in creating a description which can capture all individuals and groups of collaborators. As Stanley Hoffmann has stated, 'the subject is infernally complicated. Vichy, the pluralistic dictatorship, is complex enough. Yet it is easier to distinguish the phrases, clans, ideas, and issues in the maze of Pétain's regime than it is to do so in the story of French collaborationism. There seem to have been almost as many

[138] Jean-Paul Sartre, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un Collaborateur ?', *Situations III* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947).
[139] *Ibid.,* pp. 43 – 61.
[140] For example, see Jackson, *France: The Dark Years,* p. 508.
[141] For Paris-based collaborators, see Pascal Ory, *Les collaborateurs 1940 – 1945* (Paris: Seuil, 1976). Paxton's *Vichy France* naturally deals with collaborators, but avoids an explicit typology.

collaborationisms as there were proponents or practitioners of collaboration'.[142] However, despite the difficulties, it is possible to extend Sartre's definition by gleaning information from the many works that now exist on France during the war to create a selection of traits that give us some idea of the psychology of a collaborator. It should, however, be noted from the outset that not all traits apply to all collaborators; to be a collaborator, an individual would only require one of these to collaborate, although most would have had more than one in play, and these could have changed over time.

Many features of a collaborator derive from political beliefs. Firstly, there were those collaborators who supported and believed in the Vichy regime and its aims. Part of this group was composed of those who had become disillusioned with the Third Republic. Some would have shared the ideas of Charles Maurras, who viewed the Third Republic as the 'regime of palaver', whose fate was sown by the breakdown of authority at the time of the French Revolution.[143] Ignoring any successes the Third Republic may have enjoyed, they focused blame on the individualism the Revolution spawned, dividing political power between self-interested kaleidoscopic groups, who fragmented French society, displacing natural figures of authority and allowing outside influences to infect the public mind. This process also allowed urbanization and industrialization, leading to a powerful proletariat.[144] Although this group was not necessarily large, it can be linked in some of its views to the larger mass of conservatives who had become disillusioned with the Third Republic throughout 1930s given the political and economic

[142] Stanley Hoffmann, 'Self-Ensnared: Collaboration with Nazi Germany', *Decline or Renewal? France Since the 1930s,* ed. Stanley Hoffmann (New York, Viking Press, 1974), pp. 26-27.
[143] Shirer, *Collapse of the Third Republic*, pp. 922-927.
[144] *Ibid.,* p. 32. Paxton, *Vichy France*, pp. 23-24.

instability of the age. Although some confidence was restored with the end of the Popular Front and accession of the Daladier government in 1938, the catastrophic events of 1940 seemed a clear sign that the system as it had existed was unable to cope with the demands placed upon it.[145] Such thinking can be seen within Roger Ikor's *A Travers nos déserts,* which charts a group of young men from childhood, through their various political allegiances in the 1930s, to the war years.[146] Whilst some turn to communism and socialism, one character, Armand, is motivated by the views expressed above. Prior to the war he becomes a member of the right-wing Action Française, before holding important positions within Vichy, as part of the Parti Populaire Français.

These groups believed the German influence could be used to bring about change in France. Pétain's 'National Revolution', which had been open to interpretation from the beginning beyond a desire for reform on authoritarian lines, attracted support from these disaffected conservative groups. However, although many attracted to Vichy came from the right, the significant number of pre-war parties of the right (sometimes agreeing on policies; at other times denouncing each other) to whom Vichy was appealing meant that a coherent ideology with concomitant policies was never formulated. These groups can be approximately divided into three sections: traditionalists, modernizers and liberals.[147] To these groups should also be added pacifists, who could potentially come from any political background, although tended to come from the left. The core beliefs of the left have been summed up as

[145] Hoffmann 'Self-Ensnared: Collaboration with Nazi Germany', p. 32.
[146] Roger Ikor, *A Travers nos déserts* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1950).
[147] Richard Vinen, *The Unfree French – Life under the Occupation* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 71–77.

liberty, justice and peace; those who believed the last of these to be the most important often became collaborators.[148]

Fascists, and others from the extreme right, were equal in their condemnation of the Third Republic. They hoped to use the German occupiers to bring about change within France. However, for many Fascists, collaboration meant deliberately serving the Germans. This was further than those in Vichy wished to take collaboration, and it can be seen that the Fascist groups based in Paris, until the desperate events towards the end of the Occupation brought them to power, were opposed to Vichy due to this (although this should not preclude the fact that Vichy implemented many policies the Fascists supported, anti-Semitism providing the prime example). A firm favourite of Fascist rhetoric was European unity. They believed that through working with Hitler they could establish a new European order, with the Führer as a latter-day Charlemagne. This ideal was given fresh impetus after the invasion of the U.S.S.R., when the anti-Bolshevik nature of Fascism was finally allowed to be given full vent.[149] Once again, this was a trait shared with Vichy, although it was Fascists who volunteered to fight on the Eastern Front. It can be seen that militarism was a key part of the extreme right, as in the Milice (whose elite were the uniformed *Franc-garde*) led by the First World War hero Joseph Darnand. Collaboration gave the opportunity for adventure both within France, fighting the Resistance, and abroad, fighting for the Germans in organisations such as the *Légion des volontaires français contre le Bolchevisme* (LVF). Although many would have been ideologically motivated, adventure-

[148] Novick, *Resistance versus Vichy*, p. 15.
[149] Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 192.

seeking would have been a motivator for those who wished to collaborate.[150] Such ideological motivation is a key factor for the narrator within Serge Mit's fictionalised autobiography, *Carcasse à vendre*.[151] Within, Mit details his desire to combat communism, and his belief in a greater Europe. This prompts him to join the LVF in May 1943, after which he transfers to the Waffen SS.

More visibly than Vichy, the Fascists were highly fragmented. Political differences played some part in this. Business was attracted to Eugène Deloncle's Mouvement social révolutionnaire (MSR), whilst Marcel Déat's Rassemblement national populaire was mainly white-collar. However, what perhaps precluded any sort of unity amongst these groups was Jacques Doriot. Singled out as a leader who had the political skill and charisma to carry wider appeal, in the mould of Hitler or Mussolini, his Communist background ensured this would never take place.[152] Yet self-interest as a factor in collaboration is also important. Just as the leaders of Fascist groups (as well as Vichy) allowed their own interests to undermine unity and effectiveness, so too did ordinary members. It can be seen that the most mercenary members of the Milice, for example, used the organization for their own personal gain.[153]

Self-interest was not confined to political spheres. In business, many were keen to benefit from German trade. The Photomaton Company was one such organization, suggesting that, as Jews required photographing for administrative purposes, the

[150] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 29.
[151] Serge Mit, *Carcasse à vendre* (Paris: Dominique Wapler, 1950).
[152] Bertram M. Gordon, *Collaboration in France during World War Two* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980), p. 329.
[153] *Ibid.,* p. 332.

Germans might like to buy the company's high-quality photo machine.[154] At a more acceptable level, this took the form of black market activities. Most of France sold or bought on the black market;[155] however, although myriad illegal transactions were carried out between Frenchmen, many were also prepared to trade with the Germans. In the Landes, for example, a worthwhile trade between a local tyre merchant and the Germans developed. Clearly this must have been of some benefit to the tyre merchant, for believing that the trade had become too profitable the Germans arrested him, only releasing him upon the payment of a 50,000 franc fine.[156] The self-interest that motivated individuals to collaborate is displayed in *Les Collabos*, a short story from a collection of stories by Jean Fréville, which focuses on the Occupation.[157] As this story illustrates, the notables of the town were willing to do anything to assist the Germans that would further their own interests, which in this story are primarily financial ones. The Mayor is portrayed as being particularly callous: he tricks the local blacksmith, an Arab, into declaring he is Jewish, who can therefore be shot by the Germans in retaliation for an act of anonymous sabotage. After watching the execution, the Mayor simply returns to negotiating with the Germans over the price to be paid for a crop of apples he wishes to sell.

Even less scrupulous were those who took the opportunity to collaborate in order to settle personal scores. One prefect noted that, in the opinion of the Germans, 'à peu près toutes les affaires qui ont provoqué des condamnations de Français par les tribunaux allemands ont été soulevées par des dénonciations d'autres Français'.[158] Post-war purge trials provide evidence of many such cases, such as a girlfriend

[154] Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 294.
[155] Vinen, *The Unfree French,* p. 224.
[156] *Ibid.,* p. 239.
[157] Jean Fréville, *Les Collabos* (Paris: Flammarion, 1946).
[158] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, p. 214.

denouncing her boyfriend, who at the end of leave from Germany did not return, subsequently leaving her.[159] Some took the opportunity of collaboration to simply vent violent urges. The dynamiting of the Paris synagogues was the act of a gang operating semi-independently of Deloncle's MSR, and Bucard's Francistes, who were effectively a mafia style organization, carrying out similar (minor) acts of violence in public, and major ones in private.[160] Condemnation of such collaborationist activity by the criminal underworld is a central theme of André Héléna's *Les Salauds ont la vie dure*.[161] However, as Héléna also makes clear, such activity was not simply carried out by a criminal underworld set apart and condemned by law and the occupiers, for the novel is equally disapproving of the collaborationist activities of the Milice and police. Perhaps the most infamous real example of the form of collaborationist activity Héléna portrays is the Bonny-Lafont gang. Working for the Abwehr in Paris, the gang indulged in extortion, black-market activities and used torture to assist in tracking down resistance members.

Many collaborators were provoked into action because of their belief that the Allies had lost the War. Certainly this can be seen as an acceptable rationale in the context of the events of 1940 and 1941, and there was a tendency in the purge to excuse basic Pétainism in the early period of the Vichy regime.[162] Yet those who continued to pursue collaboration as the war progressed must be seen as being politically naïve. In the wider political picture, collaborators must have been foolish not to realize that collaboration was only benefiting the Germans. They must have

[159] *Ibid.,* p. 215.
[160] Gordon, *Collaborationism in France*, p. 333.
[161] André Héléna, *Les salauds ont la vie dure* (Paris: E-dite, 2011).
[162] Novick, *Resistance Versus Vichy*, p. 89.

been similarly blind to realize that, at the very least, the Germans could now never win the war. Although it would be unfair to castigate the wider population for not coming to this conclusion at this point, those who continued to collaborate during 1944 must have been unthinking in the utmost. A tragi-comic postscript is added to collaboration by those who fled to Germany after France was liberated and continued to bargain and argue in a world totally devoid of reality.

Individual personal desire could also play an important part in collaboration. 'Horizontal collaboration' is estimated to have led to up to 200,000 births, and those involved in romantic liaisons included well-known figures such as Coco Chanel and film stars such as Danielle Darrieux.[163] Less romantically, prostitution was also an important facet, with the Germans keen to control the profession. By the spring of 1941, twenty-nine regulated brothels had been set aside for German use only, with three specifically for officers.[164] Both romantic relationships and prostitution with the Germans are key themes within the two wartime novels of Jean-Marie Magnan, *Deux Fois dans le même fleuve*, in which the prostitutes' district plays a major role, and *A en mourir*, which similarly contains a number of prostitutes, and examines their sexual relationships.[165]

If not for reasons of romance or income, many enjoyed the company of the Germans simply to have a good time. Denise Vaillant moved to Ligueil in 1940 to help look after her ninety-year-old grandmother. Becoming friendly with a German customs officer who would often visit, these visits turned into parties and the

[163] Jean-Paul Picaper and Ludwig Norz, *Enfants maudits*, (Paris: Éditions des Syrtes, 2004), p. 386.
[164] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, p. 211.
[165] Jean-Marie Magnan, *Deux Fois dans le même fleuve* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1971), and *A en mourir* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1973).

parties into feasts which would attract German officers from as far as Tours, with other local women joining in. Enjoying the company of German officers and the goods they could provide, these women were clearly motivated by a desire for pleasant company and fun times.[166] Clearly, given the right social conditions, it would be impossible not to form friendly relations with the Germans.

Much of this supports and expands on Sartre's essay. Clearly, collaborators are a predictable phenomenon given the correct context, as both the novels mentioned above, and those examined in more detail later in this thesis attest, Sartre is right to give a clear differentiation when he states that although some collaborators were fascist, this was not a necessity.[167] Although collaborators did not have to be fascist, acquiescence (even unthinkingly) was needed. The author is perhaps wrong to place emphasis on the role of bourgeois conservatives; although this group provided the traditional support base for the political right, which in turn found it easy to support Vichy, the large-scale support that Pétain received early in the war and motivating factors stemming from self-interest, for example, meant that this view is perhaps something of a misnomer.[168] However, Sartre is not alone during the period in making this link, as the novels of Aymé, Bory, Curtis and Dutourd - discussed later - show. Sartre is, however, correct to emphasize the individuality of decisions,[169] and admits it would be wrong to attribute collaborationism to the bourgeois class as a whole.[170] A further distinguishing feature is a belief the Germans have won the

[166] Robert Gildea, *Marianne in Chains – In Search of the German Occupation* (London: Macmillan, 2002), pp. 74-75.
[167] Sartre, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un collaborateur?', p. 44.
[168] *Ibid.,* p. 44. Sartre does note self interest as a factor, p. 50.
[169] *Ibid.,* p. 46.
[170] *Ibid.,* p. 49.

war, in some cases allied to a desire for a new German-dominated Europe.[171] In one area Sartre can nonetheless be seen to wrong: his linking of homosexuality to collaboration.[172] However, Sartre is not alone in making this link. Aside from works such as Boris Arnold's *Les Amours dissidentes*, mentioned in the previous chapter, the link between homosexuality and collaboration has been maintained in fiction. Its importance is key to Michel Rachline's *Le Bonheur nazi, ou la mort des autres*, whose narrator, Frédéric Morelle, whilst born French, is an unrepentant Nazi and homosexual. Whilst Morelle can be seen as sadistic, his character can be compared to the masochistic narrator of Jean Genet's *Pompes funèbres*, who is greatly attracted to the killer of his resistance lover, the collaborator Riton.[173] However, whilst individual homosexuals may have collaborated, or supported collaborators in a manner which these novels suggest, one only has to note the moral and legislative disapproval of both the Vichy and German governments to suggest that any homosexual who collaborated would, in all probability, have done so for reasons other than sexuality, such as defence or self-interest.[174] Further to this, although a quantitative measure would be impossible, homosexual members of the Resistance, such as Pascal Copeau, further undermine this theory.[175]

Conclusion

As can be seen from the legal development of judgments on collaboration, since the war, both the meaning of the term itself and its facets have altered. This is most prominently seen in the rise of anti-Semitism as a defining feature of collaboration

[171] *Ibid.,* pp. 55-56.
[172] Sartre, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un collaborateur?', p. 58.
[173] Jean Genet, *Pompes funèbres* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978).
[174] Julian Jackson, 'Homosexuality, Collaboration, and Resistance in Occupied France', *Contemporary French Civilization* 21 (2007), p. 58, p.60.
[175] For information on Copeau's careers, see Pierre Leenhardt, *Pascal Copeau (1908-1982): L'Histoire préfère les vainqueurs* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994).

during the 1970s. Although not all collaborators were necessarily anti-Semitic, the Vichy regime certainly was, and this should perhaps be seen as the most serious charge that can be laid at the regime's door. As Robert Paxton has shown, this was carried out not under German pressure, but as an independent policy, and as early as 3 October 1940 a law excluded Jews from elected bodies, positions of responsibility in the civil service, the judiciary and the military, as well as from positions of cultural influence.[176] Although when the Germans imposed deportations to concentration camps from 1942, this led to a certain amount of reluctance from Vichy, the careers of men such as Maurice Papon, who as secrétaire général de la préfecture de la Gironde arranged for the deportation of more than 1,600 Jews to concentration camps, highlight both the complicity of the regime and the willingness of individuals to assist the occupiers.[177] Whilst Papon, as a high-ranking official, cannot be seen as a typical example, his willingness to accommodate German demands mirrors that of many in the population who, for good or evil, accepted any requests the occupier made.

However, although anti-Semitism is a key feature of collaboration, it should not blind us to other motivating issues for a collaborator, such as traditional right-wing views or simple self-interest. Even with this list of features it is, however, still difficult to attach labels in many cases. The term can be used tightly to include just a few thousand extreme cases, or on the other can be wide enough to include most of the population. Differentiation should instead rest primarily on the difference between willing and unwilling collaboration, with personal responsibility being the

[176] Paxton, *Vichy France*, p. 174.
[177] For further information on Papon's careers, see Gérard Boulanger, *Maurice Papon: un technocrate français dans la collaboration* (Paris: Seuil, 1998).

key judgment. It is with this in mind that Judaken's 'C-curve' can be applied to individuals and groups.[178]

Judaken's 'C-curve' can therefore be applied to existing historical records. However, from today's perspective, existing historical records are static, and do not reflect the changing attitudes of the last seventy years. Nonetheless, the 'C-curve' can be used as an initial model for looking at sources, such as novels, which portray the war years but have been written at different times with different understandings of that period: the 'c-curve' is therefore useful for looking not only at a static past, but works which examine the past from a later period. Even Judaken's approach, though, whilst useful in giving understanding to a variety of types of collaboration and motivation, cannot necessarily recreate the atmosphere and situations of the period. For example, an examination of the lead character in *Lacombe Lucien* alerts us to the ambiguity of motivation of some forms of collaboration, which can be placed on Judaken's schema (Lucien, who by chance joins the French Gestapo, can be seen to be involved in 'collaboration', but this is due to 'compliance' rather than 'conviction', lacking as he does any ideological motivation for his involvement). This representation also informs us about the social and political climate at the time *Lacombe Lucien* was made, and the picture of collaboration presented to contemporary audiences.[179]

Taking this further, an examination of just one text, such as André Chamson's *Le Puits des miracles*, reveals how novels can elucidate the past, and provide a representation of many areas of collaboration. *Le Puits des miracles* is set in a small

[178] Judaken 'Intellectuals, Culture, and the Vichy Years', p. 84.
[179] Louis Malle (dir.), *Lacombe Lucien* (1974).

town based on Montauban in the Midi-Pyrénées region, where Chamson wrote the novel.[180] Although the town was initially under Vichy control within the *zone libre*, during the course of the novel it is occupied by the Germans, following their 1942 occupation of the southern zone. Due to the location and period of the novel's setting, it provides both a commentary on the south of France under Vichy rule, as well as on direct German occupation. With this subject matter and period in mind, it can be seen as a sequel to Chamson's *Le Dernier Village*, which charts the French defeat of 1940.

The first-person narrator records the strange events and characters in the town, whilst remaining nameless throughout the novel, underlining his dual role of both protagonist and detached commentator.[181] This allows him to provide a representation of the war which elicits confidence in the reader, and means that he can be seen as a knowledgeable and trustworthy narrator.[182] Indeed, such is his perceived ability to record events that his role has been referred to as the 'I-am-the camera status of the narrator' by Leonard Rolfe.[183] Alongside the nameless and indistinct narrator, Chamson's novel can also be considered somewhat unusual when the lack of a unifying plot is considered, and it should be seen that the work is instead as a series of tableaux set within the town.[184] Importantly for historical understanding, however, this literary device can be seen as providing a multi-faceted understanding of the war years. As Micheline Cellier-Gelly has commented,

---

[180] Peter Tame 'André Chamson's Novel "Le Puits des miracles": France at War?', *Forum of Modern Language Studies* 41 (2005), p. 227.
[181] Margaret Atack, **'**Sins, crimes and guilty passions in France's stories of war and occupation', *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 1 (2007), p. 87.
[182] Jane E. Evans, ' The Soldier in French Literature of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries', 2009, available at http://works.bepress.com/jane_evans/7 (accessed 18 March 2013), p. 6.
[183] Leonard Rolfe, *The Novels of André Chamson* (New York: Vantage, 1971), p. 93.
[184] Tame, 'André Chamson', p. 234.

the subject of *Le Puits des miracles* is that of 'le lent pourrissement d'une ville en guerre où les valeurs se dégradent'.[185] In keeping with this approach, Chamson's novel can also be seen as having too many characters, too numerous for the reader to remember.[186] Given the tumultuous nature of the war years, and the many and varied people involved, this can also be seen as appropriate. Consideration only needs to be given to one area, such as the various individuals who populated the Vichy government over the war years, to accept this as a suitable representation of the period.

This discussion of writing style and plot devices illustrates, if exceptionally briefly at this point, the ability of novels to be constructed in a manner which lends them to the purpose of historical understanding. Yet this in itself is only a facilitator for examining the past. Here again, however, Chamson illustrates what can be possible, as short examinations of the broad areas of collaboration which this thesis considers show (daily life, intellectual and cultural, and military and paramilitary, which are defined and discussed at greater depth in later relevant chapters).

Daily life is shown both under the collaborating Vichy regime as well as under German military occupation. The town divides into two camps early in the novel, over the activities of a dog-killer, who operates from the central courtyard of the flats which the narrator inhabits. His activities can be seen as an allegory for not only the Jews (discussed below, in the context of paramilitary collaboration), but for victims of the Germans and collaboration as a whole. The harsh realities of life in the period are displayed in the character of M. de Vienne. Both civilised and

[185] Micheline Cellier-Gelly, *André Chamson 1900-1983* (Paris: Perrin, 2001), p. 223.
[186] Tame, 'André Chamson', p. 234.

caring, M. de Vienne attempts to shelter the dogs from the dog-killer. His efforts are, however, based on these characteristics, and are ultimately his undoing, for he is quickly removed from the story, arrested by faceless officials carrying out the work of the state for his interference in the work of the dog-killer. Taken for standing up for his beliefs, M. de Vienne's story points to the dangers of the period, and also illustrates the invidious nature of society in the period, when those in certain positions could carry out the destruction of those who opposed them with chilling efficiency.

Whilst the poor and the wretched of the town are indignant at the massacre of the dogs, the rich and powerful support the dog-killer. In the wider story, the increasing desperation and wretchedness of ordinary people is contrasted with the profiteering and hypocritical moralising of the rich, typified in the characterisation of M. Tourinas, who willingly collaborates in order to assist in his profiteering and general exploitation of others. M. Tourinas' activities and lifestyle, together with those of the wealthy in the town, are contrasted with the hunger shown in the poor quarter of town, as those who cannot afford the black market suffer. This difference between the rich and poor is highlighted most at a meal at which two hundred of the town's elite celebrate a recently-rediscovered Renaissance author from the region, consuming a banquet that would have sustained 'un quartier de la ville, pendant une semaine'.[187] Moreover, the above situations exemplify the problems the ordinary French faced in a situation where they were 'not at peace; not at war'.[188]

[187] André Chamson, *Le Puits des miracles* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945), p. 201.
[188] Atack, 'Sins, crimes and guilty passions', p. 80.

Alongside material considerations, the rich are also intellectually and culturally clearly identified with Pétain and the ideology of Vichy, through precise references which situate the group as enemies of the Popular Front and the Republican tradition. In this way, the wealthy support Vichy, and see France and the poor as deserving the fate they are suffering: it is 'retribution or punishment for the supposedly irresponsible and decadent way in which the French had behaved before the war'.[189] Beyond such general views that comment on the standpoint by wealthier figures within the town, Chamson also displays the ability of the novel to bring to life or represent historical figures that did exist. His representation of 'le Connard', as the government minister who visits the town to celebrate a long-dead regional poet in nicknamed, is clearly drawn from Vichy's Minister for National Education from 1942 to 1944, Abel Bonnard. It seems likely that Chamson decided to portray Bonnard, having met him in 1941 when Bonnard visited the Musée Ingres in Montauban, at which meeting the collaborationist Bonnard made a very poor impression on Chamson.[190]

The dog-killer, as mentioned above, also illustrates the activity of paramilitary organisations under the Occupation. He dresses in a beret and military jacket which are reminiscent of the Milice, the organisation he later joins.[191] Interestingly, Chamson's work contrasts with those immediate post-war novels such as Jean Genet's *Pompes funèbres* (1947), Roger Nimier's *Les Epées* (1948), Jacques Perret's *Bande à part* (1951), as well as Jean-Paul Sartre's play *Morts sans sépultures* (1946) which portray *miliciens* as devoted French soldiers who, due to

[189] Tame, 'André Chamson', p. 229.
[190] Cellier-Gelly, *André Chamson*, p. 219.
[191] Tame, 'André Chamson', p. 230.

circumstance, happened to be on the 'wrong' side of the war.[192] Whilst such works give a different representation of those involved in the Milice to Chamson, it is equally true that all the authors provide an authentic view of those involved in this form of collaboration. However, Chamson's representation is of a far more negative variety, and it seems likely that the stray dogs (the 'chiens errants' or 'bêtes errantes') which the dog-killer hunts down and kills in a wooden hut in the courtyard can be seen as parallel to the Jews under the Occupation, viewed by both Vichy and the Germans as 'Juifs errants'.[193] Through this allegory, Chamson provides both a realistic and damning verdict which can be recognised by post-war readers.

Narrative forms can therefore clearly illustrate the reasons why someone collaborated (and in what form) in a manner in which historical investigation cannot, allowing as it does a lucid view of an individual's inner thoughts and moral code. As *Le Puits des miracles* illustrates, this form takes us directly to driving beliefs and desires, without the chance of post-war denial, reconstruction of events, or the 'water-muddying' of historical impartiality. Narratives allow for attempts to re-create the psychology of events in the past, and help allow exploration of the experience and drama that are sometimes excluded from the work of historians and which can undermine our understanding of the real experience of individuals. This must be seen as highly beneficial in understanding collaboration, for any strict definition of collaboration in an historical sense is bound to fail due to the fluid nature and varying degrees of the phenomenon. Moreover, through analyses of

[192] For further discussion on this topic, see Vincent Grégoire 'Sous le signe du gamma: le rôle de la Milice de Vichy dans la littérature de l'immédiate après-guerre', *Symposium* 61 (2007).
[193] Tame, 'André Chamson', p. 230.

texts, it is also possible to judge the socio-political climate in which they were written. Chamson's work can also be read as a comment on the political battle between the left and the right in post-war France, with Gaullists and Communists competing to dominate and create myths regarding the actions of the French people during the German Occupation, as Rousso has suggested.[194]

[194] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 41 - 42.

Chapter Two: The Generic Boundaries between History, Autobiography and Fiction

The previous chapter considered the different forms collaboration could take, alongside representative samples taken from a variety of novels. Consideration will now be given to the different generic forms of history, autobiography and fiction, and the similarities and distinctions between them. This shows how novels can aid historical understanding and provide a readily available format through which the past is accessed. Initially it would seem the distinctions between the three forms are clearly delineated. At the most basic level, history is the study of the past based on verifiable evidence, autobiography an account of an individual's life written by that person, and fiction a form of literature that describes imaginary events and people. These simplistic definitions in the widest sense hold true, and these classifications provide a basic introduction to these forms of narratives. As separate genres, they contain distinctive features; they however also contain features that are comparable, as the preceding chapter illustrates.

This in turn means these similarities can undermine the boundaries that divide them. Such boundaries are not solid, and there are grey areas where two or all overlap. As Jerome de Groot has noted, 'the intergeneric hybridity and flexibility of historical fiction [has] long been one of its defining characteristics'.[195] As this chapter shows, it is possible to question the extent to which generic narratives operate differently and therefore to judge what can be expected of them as sources of historical knowledge. This chapter argues that novels, just as much as history

[195] Jerome de Groot, *The Historical Novel* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010), p. 2.

and autobiography, can make the past 'knowable',[196] justifying the study of novels as historical representations through which the past can be understood.

An examination of the similarities between history, autobiography and fiction shows that they all operate in ways in which knowledge of the past can be gained. As genres, all can be described as narratives, providing an account of linked events that present an understandable sequence. At this level it is therefore possible to see that there must be some factors shared by the three, whilst some differences remain. The three genres do not define themselves, but are evaluated according to external factors which allow the reader to judge the generic function of any given narrative. As part of this process, novels and readers are enmeshed in, and contribute to, an understanding of the past both as individuals and as part of collective memory.[197]

To examine these issues, the first half of the chapter will discuss their similarities, whilst the second will examine their differences. However, dealing with this large question within limited space requires that many statements be seen as generally true, rather than absolute. To illustrate this and move beyond purely theoretical conjecture, the phenomenon of *les Tondues* will provide a general exemplar amongst works on the Occupation in general.[198] This chapter will primarily focus on books from the three genres that deal with this issue: for history, Fabrice Virgili's *La France "virile"*; for autobiography, Charles d'Aragon's *La résistance*

[196] Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd (eds.) *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939-2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 19.
[197] *Ibid*., p. 180.
[198] Between 1943 and the start of 1946 approximately 20,000 women from varying backgrounds who were accused of collaborating with Nazi Germany had their heads shaved in punishment for this. *Tonte* (from the verb *tondre*: to mow, shear or clip), when used to describe the shaving of a human head is used uniquely in reference to the process that took place at the end of the war and during *l'épuration*. See Virgili, *La France "virile"*, p. 7.

sans héroïsme; for fiction, Guy Croussy's *La Tondue* and *Hiroshima mon amour*, directed by Alain Resnais and written by Marguerite Duras.[199] However, whilst these exemplars are the focus, other works will be drawn upon to illustrate points which *les tondues* does not provide.

Similarities Between the Three Genres

It should be noted that the genres themselves are not homogeneous within themselves, a point which should be recognised before wider consideration is given to broader issues. This assertion can be examined through Philippe Carrard's *Narrative and Historiography: Writing the France of the Occupation*, which classifies histories of the Occupation into four types.[200] 'Linear histories' are broadly chronological, and perhaps the most traditional form of history. They move through a readily understandable sequence of events, over limited or wider periods of time. 'Stage histories' although following a similar chronological pattern, instead identify key moments, periods or specific aspects throughout the time under study. Whilst similar to the previous forms, 'synchronic descriptions' identify a certain period and categorize and discuss key topics of the chosen period. Finally, 'arguments' are primarily concerned with prior works on the subject in question, adopting a more theoretical approach, debating issues such as methodology or sources.[201] Fiction and autobiography can similarly be divided into typologies. At

[199] Although *Hiroshima mon amour* is a film, it has been included in this survey primarily because of its seminal role in representing a change in attitudes towards *les tondues* in fictive form, but also because of Duras's importance as a writer.

[200] Carrard, Philippe, 'Narrative and Historiography: Writing the France of the Occupation'. Available at: http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Narrative+and+Historiography%3A+Writing+the+France+of+the+Occupation.-a068279074. Accessed 18 March 2013.

[201] Carrard states that 'stage' and 'linear' histories are narratives, but elects that his latter two classifications are not. These 'cannot be counted as narratives'. However, although as he claims they 'eschew narrative', it is perhaps overstating the case that they are completely devoid of this. One of the works he selects for 'synchronic descriptions' is Phillipe Burrin's *La France à l'heure allemand*,

the most basic level, fiction can range from categories such as fantasy, which contains elements of the unreal, to auto-fictive war narratives, which can be realistic representations of the events they describe.

One example of a novel with fantasy elements is Magnan's 1971 *Deux Fois dans le même fleuve*.[202] Its story, which takes place in Arles in the last months of the Occupation, charts the activities and choices of Gilles, the lead character. Responding to the bombing of the town, Gilles joins other young men from the town in resistance against the Germans. Whilst this story can be seen as based on real situations, it is intermingled with Gilles's relations with Laurence, a 12-year-old girl who exists only in his imagination, the reincarnation of his dead mother. Employing these facets, the novel moves between fact and fantasy with ease. In the wider story, the war is presented as burlesque and comedic, with an air of unreality and role-playing, and a strong emphasis upon accidents and ironies of chance. This storyline is aided by the confusion of the Liberation, with its summary justice, and 'secrets' that are subsequently revealed. One example is a character who is a major constructor for the Germans, who is later discovered to be one of the leaders of the local Resistance. However, even allowing for its fantasy elements, such a novel as this illustrates the ability of novels to provide access to the wartime past.

---

and Carrard identifies three areas that Burrin examines; the government, civil society, and collaborationists. Yet while this is a thematic treatment of the Occupation that examines each in turn, it cannot help but have an over-riding narrative. The situation that faced all these groups was markedly different in 1940 than 1944, which Burrin has to take account of, illustrating and explaining the developments in mainland France in the period studied. This is therefore a study that acknowledges a change in situation from one point to the next and contains a form of narrative, even if not in a strictly traditional sense.

[202] Magnan, *Deux Fois dans le même fleuve*.

Turning to auto-fictive narratives, one of the most realistic and powerfully-written is Anna Langfus' *Le Sel et le soufre*.[203] The novel, which opens with the German bombing of Warsaw in 1939, has been described as autofiction because it draws so closely on Langfus' life.[204] Increasingly fearful for their vulnerability as Jews following the Occupation of Poland, the narrator Maria and her husband Jacques are ejected from their flat to the ghetto. The novel chronicles the appallingly cruel events they face. Whilst Maria and Jacques escape the ghetto, they are forced to become reliant on those who exploit them for money. Maria becomes involved in a Polish resistance network. After evading capture for some time, the couple are eventually captured by the Gestapo; she endures dreadful torture and Jacques is shot. After time in a brutal women's prison, Marie escapes and manages to walk back to Lublin. Whilst not directly commenting on French collaboration, after its publication in 1960 the novel gained literary and public attention, winning the *Prix Charles Veillon*, and is noteworthy for being one of the earliest works in French fiction to focus on and communicate the fate of the Jews during the war.[205] Moreover, this also provides an example of literature, through imagination, communicating a past which at the time was overlooked by historians. This shows the ability of fictional works to assist in challenging and changing public assumptions of the past.

Similarly, just as fiction adopts different representative forms, autobiography can vary between the memoir of an individual and their private thoughts, to a work that describes public life and almost entirely omits the individual. Corinne Luchaire's

---

[203] Anna Langfus, *Le Sel et le soufre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1960).
[204] Lucille Cairns, *Post-War Jewish Women's Writing in French* (London: Legenda, 2011), pp. 8-9.
[205] Manuel Braganca 'Le Survivant de la Shoah face au texte de fiction: Un écran protecteur ou un écran projecteur? L'exemple d'Anna Langfus', *French Cultural Studies* 23 (2012), p. 80.

Ma drôle de vie, despite containing many well-known figures, can be seen as a personal memoir, detailing the author's private thoughts and feelings.[206] Luchaire's life was dominated by her father, Jean Luchaire, director of the collaborationist newspaper *Les Nouveaux Temps*. Her life was deeply affected by the war, during which she was accused of spying, and her father was involved with Otto Abetz and Fernand de Brinon. During the war she attempted suicide. She went to Germany with her father and her baby, was accused of collaboration, and at the age of twenty-seven was imprisoned with her father in Fresnes and then in Nice. Her father was eventually shot as a traitor during the *épuration*. Luchaire also describes her career in films, encouraged by Micheline Presle and her grandmother (Madame Dauriac, the wife of Julien Luchaire), alongside memories of film work in England, travel and friends such as Michel Simon and Ali Khan. Whilst commenting on public life, Luchaire's story is very much a personal work, with the author attempting to communicate her version of events, and allow the reader to enter her world, and Luchaire's personal style and narrative have been considered a precursor to Louis-Ferdinand Céline.[207]

It can be seen in these examples that perhaps the most important similarity which history, autobiography and fiction share is their communication through narrative form. As Peter Lamarque has stated, 'narratives can be about real people or fictional characters and their descriptive content can be true or false'.[208] Moreover, for any work to be a narrative it has to relate a change in circumstances over a

[206] Corinne Luchaire, *Ma drôle de vie* (Paris: Sun, 1949).
[207] I. H. Walker, 'Corinne Luchaire, précurseur de Céline?' *Australian Journal of French Studies* 25 (1988), pp. 42 – 50.
[208] Peter Lamarque, 'Narrative and Invention: The Limits of Fictionality' in Nash, C., (ed.), *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature* (London, Routledge, 1990), p. 132.

period of time. As Carrard illustrates well, 'the utterance "Most French people loved Marshal Pétain" is not a narrative, because it does not refer to a progression in time; but the utterance "Most French people lost faith in Marshal Pétain" is a narrative, because it describes the shift from one moment to the next and could be rewritten as "Most French people had faith in Marshal Pétain and then they lost it".[209] Thus it can be seen that narrative in essence (and most simplistically) must relate a sequence of events.

For a story to exist, events must take place over a period of time, no matter how short or long, and it is evident that history, fiction and autobiography fulfil this criterion and are similar in this. *Hiroshima mon amour* is, in story terms, a double narrative in this sense, for it not only tells of the nameless female leading character's contemporary relationship with the nameless male lead, but also relates her wartime story, from her romance with a German solider, through his death at the Liberation, to her immediate post-war treatment as a 'collaborator' and subsequent move to Paris. This form of story is authenticated through historical records and told as far as historical records permit by Fabrice Virgili in *La France "virile"*. For both *Hiroshima* and Virgili's work to tell their stories' simple description is therefore not enough. Although, for example, Bertram Gordon's *Historical Dictionary of World War II France* contains much information about the war, it is not a narrative. It is instead a list of entries about individual, places, events and so on, alphabetised. As Lamarque points out 'narrative imposes structure; it connects, as well as records'.[210]

[209] Carrard, 'Narrative and Historiography'.
[210] Lamarque, 'Narrative and Invention', p. 131.

A narrative also has to have a narrator. For any narrative to exist it must be related to an audience; Guy Croussy narrates the story of *La tondue*, Fabrice Virgili narrates the history of *Les tondues* as a group, and Charles d'Aragon narrates his own story in *Resistance sans heroisme*. Without a narrator it would be impossible for history, fiction or autobiography to exist. Yet the narrator is also a role that can take on various guises. The narrator can be real or imagined, seen or unseen, first- or third-person. Charles d'Aragon is real, and very much present throughout *La résistance sans héroïsme*, as it is his autobiography. Fabrice Virgili is not explicitly present within *La France "virile"*, although it is implicit that as an historian he chooses and forms historical records into a meaningful narrative. Both Guy Croussy and Marguerite Duras (with Alain Résnais) give form to *La Tondue* and *Hiroshima mon amour*, but characters within these narratives take on the narrator's role, telling their own stories, influenced by their own judgements and biases. This similarity also shows the ability of fiction to appropriate techniques of history and autobiography.

Inherent to narration is interpretation. In narrating, authors bring something of their own ideas to that which they wish to relate. Whatever form narrative takes and whatever content is included can be seen to be due to either deliberate or subconscious choice by the narrator: a shared feature of all three genres. This statement is most contentious within the study of history, and has been taken to its most renowned extreme by Hayden White. White believes in the past, but does not consider that it can be narrated in any way that captures and reflects continuous and successive past events. Whilst events occurred, forming them into meaningful patterns adds 'something' which is not real. Whilst historians deem they are

discovering structures contained within the past, for White these are 'real stories'. As stories are invented and not discovered, these narratives are on a par with fictional works, which bring some knowledge of the world.[211] Furthermore, White believes 'lives are lived and stories are told'.[212] What White indicates is that lives do not come in story form; we live them and consequently make stories from them using our imagination. We cannot therefore write truthful histories of individuals or impose a real order on their wider world which can fully relate all aspects of what happened.[213]

White's view has been convincingly rebutted in its specific detail by Noël Carroll, and within the wider debate about the post-modernist assault on history by Richard J. Evans. Carroll has argued that lives are not just lived, but can contain many pre-planned elements. With this plan of what is to occur in place before events occur it is possible (if events follow that plan) to subsequently chart these events and allow them to be written up by historians. Conversely, if these plans fail it can be illuminating to examine why they failed.[214] Richard Evans has taken this stance further in his book *In Defence of History*, using the Holocaust to show powerfully the validity of a verifiable historical past. Evans points out that: 'clearly, to regard it as fictional, unreal, or no nearer to historical reality than, say, the work of the

[211] Hayden White 'The question of narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory' *History and Theory* 23 (1984), p. 46.
[212] Hayden White 'The Historical Text as Literary Artifact' in Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), p. 90.
[213] Whilst it is possible that, as he believes in past events, White can be seen to remain within the field of recognised historical study, others such as Jacques Derrida have gone beyond this point. Derrida, amongst others, has argued the past has no real meaning, its only significance coming from its form as an arrangement of words whose meaning can continually change. Thus, the past is simply a 'text', forming part of a wider 'discourse' where all statements or genres are of equal value. (For a summary of these views see David Lehman, *Sign of the Times: Deconstruction and the Fall of Paul de Man* (New York: Poseidon, 1991), pp. 28-37). This thesis operates under the assumption that there is a recognisable and verifiable past, but if Derrida's views are taken as correct this would render the genres of history, autobiography and fiction as being of the same value.
[214] Noël Carroll, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', *The Monist* 73 (1990), pp. 143-145.

'revisionists' who deny that Auschwitz ever happened at all, is simply wrong. Here is an issue where evidence really counts, and can be used to establish the essential facts. Auschwitz was not a discourse. It trivializes mass murder to see it as text'.[215]

Evans also duly notes that if this is the case it does have, and has had, an effect on the post-modern position.[216] In a similar manner, because they are inserted into a fictional framework, such themes cannot simply be seen as 'text' within novels. Robert Merle's *La Mort est mon métier* tells the story of a Bavarian, Rudolf Lang, from 1913 to 1945.[217] Lang is the first-person narrator of the novel, which contains examples of his violence and brutality throughout. His involvement in massacres in Turkey in 1916 is detailed, as is his later part in anti-Communist witch hunts in the 1930s, by which point he has become a member of the Nazi party. However, the most detailed narrative within the novel comes after Lang's appointment as the commandant of Auschwitz in 1940. There are chillingly graphic descriptions of how Lang organised the systematic mass slaughter of the camp's inmates, rendered callously devoid of emotion by the author to illuminate Lang's personality. Such stories cannot be regarded as mere discourse or text, especially as the character of Lang is directly inspired by the life of the real commander of the camp of Auschwitz, Rudolf Höss. This marks it as an important attempt to understand the historical past.[218]

---

[215] Richard J. Evans, *In Defence of History* (London: Granta Books, 2000), p. 124.
[216] *Ibid*., pp. 124-126.
[217] Robert Merle, *La Mort est mon métier* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).
[218] Luc Rasson, 'When the SS man says I: on Robert Merle, Michel Rachline and Jonathan Littell', Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd (eds.) *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939-2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), pp. 168-169.

This is not, however, to say the Holocaust is not without problematic aspects which are open to interpretation through narrative representation. Historians are unsure, for example, why Hitler developed such a virulent hatred for the Jews, and this is a subject that has been discussed widely and remains a source of debate.[219] Therefore, whilst these narratives differ on this aspect, the fundamental truths are acknowledged. Similarly, the Holocaust has been interpreted in different ways by novelists and autobiographers, with different aspects being emphasised. Pierre Seel, for example, through deliberate choice based on experience, gave emphasis to homosexual experience of the Holocaust. In the early 1980s Seel became the only gay Holocaust survivor to have spoken openly about his experiences. He was an important witness who raised awareness towards this aspect of the Holocaust. Seel published his memoirs, *Moi, Pierre Seel, déporté homosexuel* in 1994, which brought his experiences to a wider audience.[220] Thus, just as in historical works, both the fictive *La Mort est mon métier* and the autobiographical *Moi, Pierre Seel, déporté homosexuel* can be seen to choose and mediate their content to represent a past which cannot simply be seen as 'text'.

Closely linked to this point is the issue of narrative distortion. Although, as discussed above, some essential facts cannot be denied, by their very nature narratives give a personal inflection to what they are attempting to represent or explain. This can be readily seen in autobiographies. As Georges Gusdorf states, 'l'homme qui se raconte se recherche lui-même à travers son histoire; il ne se livre pas à une occupation objective et désintéressée, mais à une œuvre de justification

[219] For further information on this discussion, see Ian Kershaw, *Hitler, 1889-1936: Hubris*, (London, Penguin Books, 1998), pp. 60-67.
[220] Pierre Seel, *Moi, Pierre Seel, déporté homosexuel*, (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1994).

personelle'.[221] This can also conceivably be seen in Charles d'Aragon's eye-witness account of his viewing of head shavings.[222] It is possible that his remembered distaste for the event has been heightened in his memory with the aid of hindsight. This distortion is by no means deliberate, and can, to some extent, be seen as vital for the composition of autobiography: minor individual facts can be subordinated to a wider overriding point that an individual wishes to make.[223]

Although history cannot completely subordinate and deny individual facts, selective emphasis can be given to certain evidence depending on the historian's aims, which can then illustrate the aspect the historian wishes to examine. In *La France "virile"*, Virgili sets out to provide an historical study that encompasses 1943 to early 1946. This period includes such major events as the D-day landings, the collapse of the Vichy regime, the Liberation of France and formation of a Provisional Government under de Gaulle, and the defeat of Germany. These key events are given the most fleeting coverage within Virgili's study, and only when relevant to the study of *les tondues*. This is because Virgili seeks an 'overriding truth' about one particular aspect of history, and thus relegates these wider facts to use only where necessary to his study. A complete representation of France in this period would be so unwieldy as to be impossible. The historian, like the auto-biographer, must therefore be selective in the use of facts to present an understandable narrative, even in works such as Julian Jackson's *France: The Dark Years*, which provides a wide-ranging overview of France during the war. Similarly, novelists too are selective in what they wish to represent in their novels.

[221] Georges Gusdorf, 'Conditions et limites de l'autobiographie', in Günther Reichenkron and Eric Hasse (eds.), *Formen der Selbstdarstellung : Analekten zu einer Geschichte des literarischen Selbstportraits*, (1956), p. 115.
[222] Charles d'Aragon, *La Résistance sans héroïsme* (Paris, Seuil, 1977), p. 209.
[223] Gusdorf 'Conditions et limites', p. 119.

Whilst the last two examples show inflection by narrative which suggests deliberate alteration to what they represent, it should be remembered that this process can take place without deliberate motive, as different authors can see different truths without necessarily doing so intentionally.[224] In Croussy's *La tondue*, the story clearly represents the experience of the child of a *tondue*. As his mother is also only guilty of collaboration on an exceptionally minor scale (if that), one truth that can be seen to emerge is the effect this process has not only on *les tondues* themselves but also upon those (particularly those in a vulnerable situation) emotionally close to them. Whilst these are clearly themes the author intends to draw attention to, he also highlights issues such as the display of 'mob' mentality, a recurring theme of the period. This was something Croussy did not set out deliberately to comment on, but he cannot help doing so because of the story he has chosen: this inflection is present without deliberate intention. In this, it can be seen that novels are mirrors of the world, for as authors provide illustration of different aspects of their world through their work, so too do they provide a mirror of the multiplicity of the views held within the world.

Conversely, despite narrative forms offering a means by which multiple situations and opinions can be represented, to operate they are required to draw on shared cultural knowledge. As F. E. Sparshott stated, 'an author does not create a world *ex nihilo*', and this can be seen to apply not only to history and autobiography, which can be expected, but also to fiction.[225] For example, *Hiroshima mon amour* rests on the assumption that the reader has some knowledge of the Second World War. The

[224] Morris Weitz, 'Truth in Literature', *Revue international de philosophie* 9 (1955). p. 129.
[225] F. E. Sparshott, 'Truth in Fiction', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 26 (1967), p. 4.

female lead has been, and continues to be, romantically involved with her dead German lover, and this can be seen to play an important part in her romantic involvement with her current Japanese partner. However, at no point is it explicitly pointed out that both relationships are with men who have been her 'enemies' through their respective countries' relationship to France during the War; it is assumed this shared cultural knowledge need not be stated. As Héctor-Neri Castañeda has observed, as people we always think of the existing, even when we think of the non-existing, because comprehension is impossible without it.[226]

It is true, however, that shared knowledge is not uniform in all its levels. Some forms of knowledge are obvious, and it can be taken for granted that all audiences will understand them. The female lead of *Hiroshima mon amour* stays in a hotel, and though the audience is not told this, it would seem reasonable that because of shared cultural knowledge necessary for understanding it is easily recognisable as a hotel. Other aspects of the film will be understood to different extents, such as the 1945 atomic bombing of Hiroshima which provides one of the backdrops to the film. Some will know little more than the fact that an atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima which led directly to the end of the war in Asia; some may have seen photographs and archive footage which would give the event a greater veracity. Some may even have studied the event in some detail, and be aware of factors such as approximate immediate and subsequent death and injury rates. However, although these examples relate to quite precise and realistic scenarios, they should not detract from the overriding point that even extreme cases such as science fiction

[226] Hector-Neri Castañeda, 'Fiction and Reality', *Poetics* 8 (1979), p.34.

or other fantasy rely on this phenomenon of shared knowledge,[227] and, whether they deal with readily-accessible situations or not, can be used to convey a message to their audience.

Yet, the need for shared cultural understanding to be comprehensible leads to a situation where the implications and understanding that history, autobiography and fiction convey can be modified over time, brought about by reaction to changed values and perceptions. *Les tondues* provide a focused example of changing attitudes, with the phenomenon and participants subject to developing judgements since the initial shavings. During the days of Liberation, in which much of France was involved during autumn 1944, it would seem head-shaving was at its most acceptable, as Fabrice Virgili has shown.[228] Yet this was soon questioned, with the process queried as part of a wider questioning taking place as the *épuration* became a subject of wider public consideration. Virgili uses the example of two women who had their heads shaved by the FFI at Rodez on 19 November 1944, pointing out that 'contrairement aux tontes qui s'étaient déroulées dans la même ville à la Libération, les avis sont désormais très partagés. La section locale de l'Union des femmes françaises et le Comité des intellectuels condamnent fermement cette pratique'.[229]

[227] Sparshott 'Truth in Fiction', p. 5.
[228] See Virgili, *La France 'virile'* Chapter four, 'L'explosion de la Libération'. For a specific example, see his account of the liberation of Chablis, and the section quoted from *L'Yonne républicaine* giving a narrative account of events in this town ; 'Le 25 août, les FFI prennent la ville, installent leur PC à la mairie et organisent des postes de garde. […] Ces mesures préventives prises, il fut procédé, sur le seuil de la mairie et devant une foule en liesse, à la tonsure de huit jeunes personnes qui s'étaient signalées pendant l'Occupation par leur sympathie non déguisée à l'égard des Boches'. Virgili, *La France 'virile'*, p. 108.
[229] Virgili, *La France 'virile'*, p. 151.

Whilst head shavings continued until spring 1945, this questioning marked the beginning of a trend that saw the process as an ugly phenomenon. Additionally, the French moved into a phase where, instead of wishing to deal with the end of the war and come to terms with those considered traitors, they now wished to attempt to forget and move back towards as normal a life as possible. Those subject to head-shaving could still be stigmatised as guilty, but their silent response was mirrored by those who had carried out the shavings. Whilst in the immediate period of Liberation they had been regarded in a largely heroic light, carrying out mob wishes in punishing collaborators, they quickly wished to distance themselves from what had become perceived as unsavoury acts, which moreover were the ideal activity for 'eleventh hour' resisters against largely helpless victims.[230]

It is difficult to chart changes that took place in perceptions towards *les tondues*, yet *Hiroshima mon amour* shows that, by 1960, the idea of a woman being punished (in such a public and distasteful manner) for the 'crime' of having been in love with the 'wrong' man was largely not acceptable, and open to being challenged through the production of a film which engenders sympathy. The narrative of *Hiroshima mon amour* shows a woman punished for romantic involvement with a German soldier, common amongst *les tondues*. Yet despite the recognisable story of a *tondue* the female lead represents, the reaction to this narrative shows how public reaction can develop and change over time. Moreover, the function of this narrative is further developed and used; much as Marguerite Duras illustrated the developed attitude towards *les tondues*, so too have later fictional and historical works. Both Croussy's *La Tondue* and Virgili's *La France "virile"* take a sympathetic stance,

[230] Virgili, *La France 'virile',* p. 4.

but Croussy's case examines the effects of head shavings on the young child of a *tondue*, whilst Virgili depicts the victims as women in a man's world, emphasising the sexist nature of punishments, and attempts to place the women involved centre stage.[231] Once again, this points to the fact that novels can communicate experiences of the past by appropriating historical techniques, and provide a useful means by which history can be understood and appreciated.

Narratives can therefore take on different meanings with the passing of time. However, this development is in no way uniform. For Charles d' Aragon writing in the 1970s, the process of head-shaving seems to be unacceptable, and he desires to highlight the hypocrisy of those who carried out or supported shavings. This is in keeping with d'Aragon's background as a 'true resistant', and a post-war supporter of 'Gaullism of the left', which led him to support the efforts of Pierre Mendès France. During the war d'Aragon was a member of the small circle of the pioneers of French resistance. Based in Lyon, following the defeat of 1940 he was successively a member of both clandestine groups Liberté and Combat. In the spring of 1943 he won promotion within the Resistance, and in the spring of 1944 he went to Paris, assisting in the liberation of the capital in August. Following this, he assisted in the freeing of his native Languedoc. Such information as this shows that d'Aragon was writing from a specific background and viewpoint.

D'Aragon describes a meeting of town notables at the time of the Liberation in his memoirs, which illustrates his distaste for the events being carried out. After Mgr Saliège (the Archbishop of Toulouse, an outspoken critic during the Occupation of

[231] *Ibid*., pp. 12, 14.

the Germans' treatment of the Jews and conscription of Frenchmen) exclaimed 'On ne refera pas la France avec des methods allemandes!', d'Aragon goes on to describe and judge, somewhat ironic but in a truthful manner, events he himself had witnessed the previous day: 'Sur la grande place d'Albi, un groupe d'hommes, sous la surveillance d'un ancien séminariste, tondait courageusement des prostituées. J'ai saisi tondeuses et ciseaux. Affreux étaient les visages de ceux qui regardaient la scène en s'en délectant. En toutes circonstances et en tous lieux, les villes sont prêtes à sécréter l'horrible public des exécutions capitales. Le lendemain, un coiffeur vint à la préfecture me réclamer les outils que j'avais confisqués'.[232]

Clearly, this opinion towards the head-shavings and their perpetrators can be seen to foreshadow later attitudes towards the phenomenon. But perhaps more importantly, it illustrates that there can be no such thing as one overriding narrative - this again is a common feature to history, autobiography and fiction. Each author brings his unique view to what he wishes to present. D'Aragon's narrative of his experience of observing shavings (amongst his wider activities during the period) is unique to him as a person, just as Virgili emphasises the unique nature of his *La France "virile"* not by placing the women themselves at the core of the work, but as a paradigm through which the *épuration* process can be viewed.

Thus, each narrative will focus on features of what it seeks to represent, define or explain based on conscious or sub-conscious authorial intention. The author, either deliberately or not, wishes to present his narrative in a certain way. Similarly, readers can deliberately (or not) emphasise aspects they find important or attention-

[232] D'Aragon, *La Résistance sans héroïsme*, p. 209.

grabbing. Because a narrative has the function the author decides, they produce something unique.[233] This can be due in part to what F. R. Ankersmit identified in the statement that 'the fragrance of a period can only be inhaled in a subsequent period'.[234] When finding material on which to base history, fiction or autobiography, authors make specific choices and select material based on aspects they wish to examine. Virgili focuses his material on 'la tondue' rather than 'les tondues' en masse, Croussy highlights aspects that affect the child of a victim of head-shaving, and d'Aragon emphasises their fate to highlight resistance excess. All narratives tell of head shaving, but through different perspectives. Through the ability to offer varying narratives, the different genres have a likeness and ability to communicate the past.

This is due, in part, to all three genres having source material from the past. Whilst history and autobiography are, by their nature, narratives of past events, it perhaps seems abnormal that fiction - which can be set at any time, including the future - has its basis in the past. However, as discussed above, for fiction to be comprehensible it has to be based on the existing, or something from a group's past. It is through this need we can deduce there is not one 'true' narrative in any genre. Freeman has pointed out that memory is an interpretive act.[235] As history, autobiography and narrative have their basis in the past, they must be interpreted, and are therefore open to different interpretations creating different narratives.

[233] Carroll, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', p. 146.
[234] F. R. Ankersmit, 'Historiography and Postmodernism', *History and Theory* 28 (1989), p. 146.
[235] Mark Freeman, *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative,* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 29.

This introduces the issue of the creative process, which can be seen as a vital factor for all three forms of narrative, and is closely linked to the previous issue of the narrative uniqueness. As discussed, all narration requires production and structuring, and it would be impossible to produce or structure any narrative work without creative input.[236] Referring to the creation of fiction, Robert Holton has noted that the novelist does not simply create a reproduction of the world, but instead 'through the creation of a coherent narrative representation from a specific point of view, produce instead a rhetorically-nuanced image',[237] a viewpoint equally applicable to history or autobiography. Nonetheless, it should be noted that authors of all three genres might attempt to create verifiable reality to a greater or lesser extent in their works.

Having accepted that history, fiction and autobiography are all products of the past, we must also accept that they are partly the product of memory - and memories of the past are not absolutely real, because they are based on memory, which can never be entirely accurate. Of the four primary authors selected in this chapter, Croussy, born in 1937, had no adult experience of the Second World War, and Virgili none at all, having being born in 1961. Their representation of *la tondue* is therefore based on information gained from sources outside of their personal experience, either as a witness or participant. Both would have no doubt been aware of the shavings that took place in France as part of shared cultural knowledge, and it would seem Croussy clearly used imagination in the most obvious way, shaping a story round a fictional *tondue* which would appear to be largely based on this

[236] Lamarque, 'Narrative and Invention', p. 132.
[237] Robert Holton, *Jarring Witnesses: Modern Fiction and the Representation of History* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994), p. 47.

shared knowledge. Virgili has based his representation on sources such as contemporary newspaper reports and administrative records. However, he has still used imagination, as can be witnessed in the method he uses to access the subject, as well as in the conclusions drawn.

For example, to produce an in-depth study in one volume of this phenomenon throughout the whole of France would be impossible; instead, Virgili focuses on three of France's ninety departments.[238] This is a logical approach to managing a potentially enormous source base, but thus contains a creative process, for Virgili could have chosen instead four departments, for example, or taken a completely different approach altogether. Similarly, for Virgili to understand why men and women carried out head shavings - the book's primary aim - again requires imagination in attempting to access others' mentalities at a distance of fifty-five years, which can be compared with the technique employed by novelists.

The memoirs of d'Aragon highlight a different role for imagination: unlike Croussy and Virgili he has written of events at which he was present.[239] Yet that does not mean that imagination does not play an important part in the narrative he creates, and imagination can be seen as operating both contemporaneously to the events he witnessed, as well as in their reporting. Firstly, d'Aragon can be seen to use his imagination in what he views, for his view is unique to him, although it can be said his views would have had aspects in common with those around him. His disgust at the head shaving of two prostitutes leads to his intervention, as he (correctly)

[238] Virgili, *La France 'virile'*, p. 59. The departments studied are the Oise, the Côtes-du-Nord, and the Indre.

[239] Duras appears to have left no confirmatory evidence that she witnessed any shavings, although she was in Paris at the Liberation, a period she has described in her wartime memoirs. See Marguerite Duras, *La douleur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1993).

imagines the event to be unpleasant and unnecessary. However, through giving his account an ironic edge, by referring to the 'courageous' way in which the men were shaving the defenceless prostitutes' hair (in comparison with those fighting the Germans, who were not defenceless), he imagines them to be cowardly. Although this may indeed be the case, there appears to be no evidence for such an assertion. D'Aragon does not claim to know the men, but gives the impression that he imagines them to be cowards or bullies, despite lacking any knowledge of them beyond the head shaving. Even though he was present, d'Aragon uses creative ability to imbue those he writes of with potentially fictional characteristics, just as a novelist would.

This illustrates the imaginative process that takes place when memories are recalled. There are problems inherent in the act of remembering, for, as Philip Roth has stated, 'memories of the past are not memories of facts but memories of your imaginings of the facts',[240] which can be seen in the case of d'Aragon. Moreover, d'Aragon has to imagine his memories into a coherent form for them to become an understandable reality. However, as Hayden White has argued, this creation of reality 'attached to narrativity in the representation of real events arises out of a desire to have real events display the coherence, fullness, and closure of an image of life that is and can only be imaginary'.[241] Whilst d'Aragon is undoubtedly presenting a reality in his memoirs, and this must be seen as a factor of primary importance, this argument highlights that some imagination, as in all the genres, is impossible to avoid in memory-based narrative creation. Linked to this is the

[240] Philip Roth, *The Facts: A Novelist's Autobiography* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1988), p. 8.
[241] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 24.

construction of narratives and their ability to distort, as natural and deliberate memory recall and the choice of how these memories are utilized are influenced by culturally specific issues. Moreover, whilst these issues can be culture-specific, it should be noted that the processes of imagination and memory are not always committed to providing an accurate representation. As Mark Freeman asks in pointed fashion, 'is it possible to live *without* fiction and myths?' - to him, it is clearly not.[242] It can perhaps be argued that fiction and myths are as important for 'reality' as the 'truth', which in turn has a concomitant effect on the production of history, autobiography and fiction.

Such blurring of fact and reality is seen in Magnan's 1973 *A En Mourir*. Many facets of the novel are recognisable features of the period of the Liberation, which is the background for complex emotional and sexual plotting: the departure of the Germans, the arrival of the Americans, and a series of internal settling of accounts between the French people, which includes key female characters having their heads shaved. However, much of the story is the fantasised repetition in Alain's mind of his meeting as a child with Brigitte, daughter of Gilbert, who was Alain's mother's lover, and who is suspected by Alain of being her killer. Whilst Gilbert is both a key supplier of works to the Germans and a major figure in the Resistance, and much of the novel is recognisable, much understanding of the period is accessed through Alain's fantasy relationships, which can be seen to be as vital to an understanding of the story as 'reality'. In this case, this illustrates the ability of the novel to access the past in a way which historical works cannot.

[242] Freeman, *Rewriting the Self*, p. 115.

Whilst imagination is necessary for the creation of narratives in the three genres discussed, it also plays a part in their reception. In the case of *les tondues*, the vast majority of those who now read about them will have neither witnessed nor directly experienced the head shavings. Therefore, as most will only have knowledge of the events through shared cultural knowledge, any additional information is gained through history, fiction or autobiography, and mediums such as plays, films, photographs and songs. Yet, alone, these media cannot create in the receiver's mind an impression of what such events were like for those participating or observing. For example, a written narrative, no matter how descriptive, will require some imagination to conjure up in the mind's eye the qualia of what is being described. Similarly, a visually-presented narrative will require imagination to attempt to understand the emotions involved. No matter how successfully a narrative presents its contents, if the audience has not experienced what is being presented, imagination is necessary to understand what is read.[243]

This process allows narratives to break through the boundaries of everyday life. Most individuals have never, and can never, experience the head shavings that took place at the close of the war. Therefore a work of history, autobiography or fiction can give the audience the chance to examine such events and attempt to understand people and experiences which would otherwise remain outside of their everyday lives: fiction offers the possibility of 'breaking through the horizons of everyday life',[244] and applying this point to wider narrative forms, it can be stated that all

[243] Thus also limiting what we can see or understand. As Holton has pointed out, it is only possible for us to imagine what is thinkable or followable. Holton, *Jarring Witnesses*, p. 34.

[244] Jens Brockmeier and Rom Harré, 'Narrative Problems and the Promises of an Alternative Paradigm' in Jens Brockmeier and Donal Carbaugh (eds.), *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture* (Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 56.

three genres offer the audience the chance to examine perspectives on the events described.[245]

Whilst barriers therefore exist between the real world and past or fictional ones they are not solid. We respond to narrative worlds as we would the real world, yet the relationship is one-way. We can know of the people or events contained within a narrative, but not vice-versa. Similarly, the audience can be emotionally involved with figures portrayed, but this can only be on an emotional and not physical level.[246] Conversely, the three genres also share a common feature in that they can portray 'characters' in a non-personal and non-emotional manner. As Philippe Carrard has pointed out, narratives need not focus or provide representation for 'flesh and blood people who populate a small town or dominate a politician's cabinet'.[247] Instead, they can be made up of what have been labelled as 'quasi-personnages'[248] or 'social individuals'[249], and are essentially entities partially made up of human individuals, but also partly of other components, such as the "Resistance", or "Vichy" - or even "trade", or "food supply". Thus, the individuals involved in the head shavings are not isolated, but are parts of the greater 'character(s)' of the period, such as 'liberation' or 'collaboration'.[250]

Despite breaking the barriers of everyday life and involving characters on a personal and wider level, narrative forms are also complete entities within

[245] *Ibid*., pp. 55-56.
[246] Kendell L. Walton, 'How Remote are Fictional Worlds from the Real World?', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 37 (1978), p. 12.
[247] Carrard 'Narrative and Historiography', p. 5.
[248] Paul Ricoeur, *Temps et récit* I (Paris: Seuil, 1983), p. 255.
[249] Arthur C. Danto, *Narration and Knowledge* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), p. 258
[250] *Ibid*., p. 5.

themselves. This is not to claim that they tell the 'complete truth' on their own, but can, through their narratives, convey stories and information which form part of the wider picture.[251] *Hiroshima mon amour,* for example, gives an account of the wartime experience and post-war romance of the female lead. It can be viewed as an account of *les tondues*, or of the psychological effects of head-shaving, or of a later post-war romance. All of these are themes (and there are many more) which link into other narratives; yet the film can be watched without any further link to these themes. It is capable of solitary existence without the necessity of recourse to further examine these themes, as are all the other works referred to in this chapter, even if it requires a viewer's consciousness to be understood.

Before turning to the dissimilarities that exist between the three genres, it is beneficial to examine one final factor. This is, perhaps, the most germane to the wider context of this thesis: the ability of history, autobiography and fiction to perform a wider cultural function by assisting individuals and society to understand themselves; where they have come from and where they are going, as can be seen by the lively debate that exists around the nature of history, fiction and narrative. Whatever the debate, Robert Holton is undoubtedly correct when he states that the 'creative dialogue concerning the significance of the past and the diverse narratives of temporality and social identity emerging more and more from such a dialogic situation constitutes an important mode of working through the long objective social crisis that this century has experienced'.[252] Indeed, as France attempts to come to terms with its wartime past, the narrative forms that represent this crisis are worth studying within themselves, and make it necessary to study not only

[251] Carroll, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', p. 154.
[252] Holton, *Jarring Witnesses*, p. 257.

traditional historical sources but also autobiography and fiction, as this 'plenitude of historiographic testimony is, perhaps, the closest we can ever approach to grasping "the whole story" of the past'.[253] Moreover, in light of this, it can be seen that novels perform an important role in informing society about the past, and it is the functioning of this role which this thesis examines.

Dissimilarities Between the Three Genres

It should first be noted that both history and autobiography require evidence in a manner which fictional works do not. Even Haydn White does not entirely destroy the boundaries that exist between historical writing and fiction (although he does look for and judge on metaphorical aptness).[254] In essence, historical writing refers to past events that did (or possibly did) occur and factors that explain (or possibly explain) them, and these two functions must be produced on a verifiable record of evidence. The work of Virgili in *La France "virile"* is based on evidence that should stand up to scrutiny were it investigated for errors. Charles d'Aragon's memoirs are based on a personal archive of memory, and whilst this may not be as reliable as the written primary documents used by Virgili, the concept remains the same: if d'Aragon's autobiography is to be believed, it must retain broad veracity under scrutiny. Alternatively, Croussy's *La Tondue*, whilst set in realistic settings and containing realistic characters, contains a narrative that would not find any support that would confer truth on it if it were subject to any form of verification processes. The characters contained within it never existed, although the events clearly did – despite, in this case, the content being believable: as a fictional narrative, it does not have to be.

[253] Holton, *Jarring Witnesses*, p. 257.
[254] Carroll, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', p. 135.

Indeed, it can be seen that autobiography can be utilised as an historical source. The provenance of the document can be examined, the motive of the author can be sought, the time it was written can be examined, and all this can be related to other historical documents. However, despite these broad similarities, it can be seen that the autobiographical writer is not at a personal distance from their subject, unlike the historian, and this lack of detachment is a vital part in understanding the features that divide autobiography from history.[255] Despite the autobiographer attempting to adopt an objective stance, this becomes difficult due to the writer and the object of study being both present within one individual, who nevertheless exist at two different points in time. Autobiography, as Georges Gusdorf notes, 'exige que l'homme prenne ses distances par rapport à soi-même, afin de se reconstituer dans son unité et son identité à travers le temps'.[256] It is this issue of the self that is vital in marking out autobiography as a specific genre, for autobiography is concerned with self-knowledge, and is an exploration of a private realm that cannot be accessed in the same way by another. This exploration of the internal self is therefore a 'second-reading' of experience that, whilst not being 'truthful' (in so much as the past can never be recaptured entirely), does allow the author the opportunity to add a new consciousness to a being they no longer are.[257]

This consciousness is not however necessarily true to actual historical experience either, for control of the internal realm of the individual allows another characteristic distinctive to autobiography to come to the fore – namely, the ability

[255] However, despite being true in the majority of cases, this is not always necessarily so. Robert Aron's *Vichy* is clearly influenced by the author's own wartime experience. For a discussion of this, see chapter six.
[256] Gusdorf, 'Conditions et limites de l'autobiographie', p. 111.
[257] *Ibid*., pp. 114-115.

to win back what has been lost and remains valued by the author. This may be as self-interested as the desire to improve a tarnished reputation through an individual's own presentation of their past, such as the former Waffen SS member Christian de la Mazière,[258] or may be based on more altruistic motives. Charles d'Aragon may desire to record what he sees as the 'truth', but in doing so ensures his voice is heard. Moreover, his memoir of his resistance allows in him to, in some ways, 'cheat' death. Although physical degeneration will lead to his eventual passing, in his written work he is forever youthful and remains in this self-selected form for posterity.

Fictional works do not require these (greatly varying) forms of factual veracity, and this is a key difference which delineates fiction from history or autobiography. Whilst history and autobiography are constrained by the past to include events that happened, fiction is free to include whatever the author wishes. The fantasy elements within Marcel Aymé's short stories in *Le Vin de Paris* (notably 'Dermuche', in which a man turns overnight into a new-born baby, and 'La Bonne Peinture', where painters, through their pictures, become able to nourish the body), set during and just after the Occupation, by their very nature contain aspects that cannot be true. Despite the need for veracity which fiction does not have, this importantly does not preclude fiction from containing historical facts which can provide knowledge of the past. In Jean Dutourd's *Au Bon Beurre*, the Poissonard family visit Vichy and meet Pétain. Although obviously the fictional Poissonard family never existed, so could not meet Pétain, the Marshal was himself a real historical figure, and any reader who had no prior knowledge of him would gain an

[258] Philippe Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler: Memories from the Outcasts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 210.

image of the man that fits with historical record, showing that novels and stories can show an image of the past as supported by historical records. Moreover, as de Groot has pointed out, not only do novels generally abide by rules about historical veracity, but where changes are made and the audience 'hoodwinked' it is done so with their self-conscious and self-aware collusion.[259]

Notwithstanding this ability to allow an understanding of the past that fits with other historical sources, it has been argued - for example by Joseph Margolis - that fiction remains fiction even when it contains real events or people, and that they are simply a gloss on the story being told. Margolis stated that 'insofar as we regard a story as a story, as a fiction, we dismiss the question of its truth or falsity about events and persons in the actual world as altogether ineligible'.[260] Margolis continues that fiction is an imaginary world provided by the sentences with which the story is made up. Even if a fictional world contains recognisable features - for example, Paris - it only contains those features given to it by the author. Therefore the Paris created by the author is not the real Paris, but a fictional place. Similarly, named individuals (such as Pétain) are fictional because they are taking part in fictional events. If the author intends his work to comment on the real world, this comment is not part of the story, but is instead a gloss. This therefore creates something of a quandary for reality in fictional works, for any comment about the real world is either part of the story and a fiction - or alternatively, if a truth, by its nature of being verifiably real, it is not part of the story, because Margolis believes stories by their nature cannot be real. However, although these arguments should

[259] Groot, *The Historical Novel*, p. 6.
[260] Joseph Margolis, *The Language of Art and Art Criticism* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1965), p. 155.

not be taken too far, they do illustrate the interchangability of 'real' situations and those that are fictional: the key issue at this point is that even if such stories are not real, fiction remains a referential genre.[261]

This can be seen in twenty-first century works on the Occupation, which are careful to make their works understandable in a way that would not have been necessary for works published in the immediate aftermath of the war to be read by those with experience of the period. One such example is Valentine Goby's 2007 *L'Echappée*, which examines the theme of *les tondues*.[262] Madeleine, a 16-year-old waitress and chambermaid, meets a German officer and pianist, Joseph Schwimmer, who lodges at the hotel where Madeleine works. After asking her to assist him turning the pages of musical scores in his practice recitals, a love affair quickly ensues. Schwimmer is drafted to the front and Madeleine hears no further news of him. In 1941, she gives birth to their daughter, Anne. Due to this relationship, at the Liberation she is shaved and tattooed with a swastika for her "collaboration". When Anne, who has grown into a child, finally sees the tattoo Madeleine has tried to conceal from her, Madeleine decides to tell her about her German father. Determined to declare pride rather than shame about her heritage, Anne begins to draw the swastika on her own breast and to call herself by her father's surname.

Her detachment and aggressive behaviour alienate her from other children, their parents, and her teachers, just as her mother has been alienated by society. Finally, when her first love dismisses her out of hand after he learns of her past, she begins

[261] A recent illustration of the problematic issues surrounding maintaining a strict division between fiction and real verifiable situations can be seen in the controversy surrounding Yannick Haenel's 2009 novel on the Polish resister Jan Karski, which both relativized and suggested Allied complicity in the Holocaust. Yannick Haenel, *Jan Karski* (Paris: Galliamrd, 2009).
[262] Valentine Goby, *L'Echappée* (Paris: Gallimard, 2007).

to understand, identify with, and adopt her mother's attitude of shame. Within this story, which highlights the blame and shame that were attached to those guilty of such 'crimes', Goby also brings an understanding to the present generation, and through the character of Anne highlights the difficulty of gaining a true appreciation of the stigma which numerous women at the time faced. However, to achieve this Goby needs to add further details which will allow a modern audience fully comprehend her story and its implications which would not be necessary to a novel which was more contemporary to the events it describes, to make her imagained story understandable.

Freeman has also noted that the theory that memory is an interpretive act also has implications for memoirs. Following his line of argument, if fiction turns the real into the imagined, then autobiography turns the imagined into a subjective reality.[263] The author, recalling his life, presents his individual viewpoint as the truth. Certainly there is some value in these arguments. The autofictive novels of Louis-Ferdinand Céline's *D'un Château l'autre* trilogy can distort reality, for example through the author-narrator's descriptions of Paris.[264] Whilst he describes a recognisable Paris, his rambling and bitter hatred for those around him casts the city in the reflective glow of his opinions, and makes it a fictional city, in many ways unrecognisable in the light in which it is seen.

However, there are limits to qualify the approaches adopted by Margolis and Freeman. Whilst reading fictional works from a perspective of literary criticism it is possible to waive the issue of whether they contain elements that are historically

[263] Freeman, *Rewriting the Self*, p. 113.
[264] For a discussion of Céline, see chapter four.

true or false, but this should not exclude fictional works being read from a perspective that examines issues such as the veracity of characters or events.[265] Instead, it is the case that whilst Margolis and Freeman's arguments can be seen as applicable in some cases, their arguments cannot be applied universally, as F. E. Sparshott has argued. Sparshott notes that it is impossible to divide fiction from truth, because there is no distinct dividing line between the real world and the imagined world. Similarly, recognisable named features (again, such as Paris) are the same in fiction as in reality, not only in the features that an author gives that match reality, but also in all those the author does not specifically change (for example, even if not mentioned, Paris exists with the Eiffel Tower in all novels set in the city, unless the author deliberately states it does not).[266]

This prompts consideration of another difference between history, fiction and memoir, namely the varying latitude through which they are allowed to distort what they represent. In broad terms it can be seen that the three offer a sliding scale of truthfulness. History should attempt to represent as truthfully as possible the past it wishes to represent; memoir, offer a recollection based on memory, and fiction has the freedom to distort, if it chooses, at will,[267] and this can be seen to be the case in a number of examples. Therefore, Robert Paxton's definitive *Vichy France* gives a verifiable account of the Vichy regime and its role in governing France between 1940 and 1944, Christian de la Mazière's autobiography records his war based on his memory and his opinions at the time the work was written, whilst Michel

[265] Weitz, 'Truth in Literature', p. 117.
[266] Sparshott, 'Truth in Fiction', pp. 6-7.
[267] This argument assumes that in fiction it is possible to show a verifiable reality if the author wishes. The argument can, however, be conversely applied to the arguments of Margolis. If fiction is a story, and by its nature cannot contain reality, then it is impossible for fiction to distort reality, because it contains nothing real.

Tournier's *Le Roi des aulnes* contains mythological images which take aspects of the novel out of reality.[268]

This scale, whilst applicable in many cases, is not relevant in all. Firstly, it should be emphasized that this scale does not contain strict lines which delineate the boundaries between the three genres. Pascal Jardin's *La Guerre à neuf ans* contain many elements that never occurred, and much of the content is fictional.[269] This is not, however, the fault of the author's memory, but can instead be seen as an attempt to construct a memoir that is a better story, and one which will be a more pleasurable and interesting experience for the reader (and, one suspects, also the author). The line can also be seen to be blurred between genres by works that defy classification. This is the case with Céline's *D'un Château l'autre* which can perhaps be best described as autofictive. To label it a novel would betray its autobiographical elements, whilst to describe it as autobiography would undermine the author's own premise that it is a work of fiction and one which utilizes his skill as a fictive author.[270]

Secondly, it is possible for all three genres to break down completely, which in turn allows all three forms to equally distort the reality they represent. Moreover, it is also possible for existing works to distort reality in the views they show being undermined by factors such as new research, highlighting the changes that can happen in the reception of history, fiction and memoir over a period of time. This was the case with Robert Aron's *Histoire de Vichy 1940-44*, first published in

[268] Michel Tournier, *RdA*. For a discussion of this work, see chapter six.
[269] Pascal Jardin, *GNA*. For a discussion of this work, see chapter six.
[270] Assuming the style is deliberately fragmented and not the result of the disintegration of his personality.

1954.[271] Aron's *Histoire* is exactly that: a history. It is also a history based on evidence. Aron used eyewitness testimonies as his sources, as well as trial records from the *Haute Cour*. Additionally, he makes use of a wide range of unpublished sources from political and business figures. At first glance, this makes Aron's large study seem a formidable and reliable guide to the period – as, indeed, it was for fifteen years; the standard historical reference work for the period. Yet the work was, for all this, flawed. The testimony of individuals from the period was difficult to check, and as men who were formally involved with Vichy provided much of the evidence, this could also be biased. Moreover, Aron's book did not have the benefit of considered hindsight, being published only ten years after the end of the war.[272]

What Aron therefore produced was a history that diminished the responsibility of the Vichy regime and its policies for much of what occurred in wartime France. Moreover, in Aron's study, there were also two distinctive attempts to enact policy in France based around Pétain and Laval. For Laval, the armistice reversed France's alliances in favour of Germany, but to Pétain it was a hiatus whilst France awaited the outcome of the war between Britain and Germany. This makes collaboration something of a 'mistake' by the Vichy government, based on misunderstanding on between its two principal members on the purpose of their government. However, a key point is that Aron stresses the Vichy regime was playing a double game, on the one hand dealing with the Germans, but on the other keeping in touch with the Allies through "secret negotiation", of which Aron makes much.

[271] Robert Aron, *Histoire de Vichy 1940-1944* (Paris: Fayard, 1954).
[272] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 281 - 283.

This, then, effectively provides an "excuse" for the Vichy regime, which for the most part in Aron's history attempted to shield its people from the excesses of the occupying Germans; in this, it can be compared to other historical works published in this period, such as Marcel Baudot's 1960 *L'opinion publique sous l'occupation*.[273] Baudot's work, which underplays collaboration to a great extent, is based only on archive material of one department, the Eure. Lack of geographical range, combined with selective representation, limits the perceived levels of collaboration. However, in 1972 a work was published that radically changed all these views: Robert O. Paxton's *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1944*. Paxton conclusively showed that Vichy had never been involved in any form of "double game", and had certainly not been involved in any resistance against occupying forces. To the contrary, it had in fact actively encouraged collaboration. This collaboration also went hand-in-hand with the National Revolution, a programme which, again, Vichy had energetically pursued, despite Aron's claims, in an attempt to re-order society. Damningly, Paxton also showed Vichy's compliance and initiative in willingly assisting in the deportation of Jews. Thus Paxton's book made the work of Aron obsolete.[274]

What, then, is obsolete history? Between its publication in 1955 and the publishing of Paxton's work in 1972 it was a history of the period. However, whilst it remains a history of the period in style and form, it is now shown to be wrong in its central conclusions. If these conclusions are wrong, they are not true. If they are not true, they can therefore be said to be fiction. Whilst it cannot be claimed that Aron's

[273] Marcel Baudot, *L'opinion publique sous l'occupation: L'exemple d'un département français (1939-1945)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1960).
[274] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 291.

work (which still contains many true facts) has become a form of novel, his story – that is not real - must surely now be seen as fiction, as it is disproved history. However, despite now being fiction, Aron's work is judged by the genre in which he placed it. Novels instead free their authors from the constraints of history.

Yet despite this, it is possible to find some truth in the work if read with a view to finding an autobiographical element within it. Prior to the war, Aron worked as part of the *mouvement Ordre nouveau* with Jean Jardin. During the war, Aron, who was Jewish, was imprisoned for a time in the Mérignac camp near Bordeaux because of this. After release, Aron was shielded in Vichy for a time by Jean Jardin, now Laval's *directeur de cabinet*, after which Jardin arranged papers for Aron to escape from France to Algeria. Aron's history can therefore be seen in this light to be representative of his own experience. Persecuted as a Jew, he is "shielded" by Jardin, who represents the Vichy government.[275] Whilst clearly not the experience of the vast majority of the population, it would seem Aron's historical views are partly born of his own experience.

Aron's work can thus be seen to occupy, to differing extents, all three of the genres whilst at the same time none at all. In simple terms it is not an autobiography; nor is it a novel - but it is a history. Yet it is a history with its narrative proven to be wrong, and therefore has to be fictitious. However, it is not entirely fictitious. Beyond facts and descriptions that can be seen to be true, it contains a measure of autobiographical insight. This illustrates that not only are some narrative forms indistinct, and that the lines between them can blur, but also that the lines can, as

[275] Aron, *Histoire de Vichy*, p. 605-606. Aron notes that Jardin 'dans sa demeure a recueilli des résistants menacés'.

Aron's book shows, be largely swept away. Additionally, all three genres can change as the 'truth' changes with advances in our understanding of the past and the world around us.

This change in the perception of what is true and what is not tends, in the wider picture, to be a phenomenon which primarily affects the genre of history, although it may also affect autobiographical works. This is because history tends to deal with stories that cover a wider range of public events than fictional works. Croussy's *La tondue* tells the story of one woman and those around her. Virgili's work encompasses, although not in the same depth, hundreds of cases, and his conclusions could potentially be challenged. It would be much more difficult to challenge the veracity of the story in *La tondue*.

This development is partly explained by R. G. Collingwood: 'the enlargement of historical knowledge comes about mainly through finding how to use as evidence this or that kind of perceived fact which historians have previously though useless to them… Evidence is evidence only when someone contemplates it historically'.[276] Whilst this is true, it is also not a complete argument, for historians not only find new evidence, but also re-use existing evidence in new ways. However, the primary point remains that the genre of history is constantly developing, which in turn renders some previous works obsolete, in part or in whole. Similarly, just as a work of history can be debunked, so too can autobiographies, if elements within them are found to be untrue - and both too are open to criticism if they are found to be inaccurate. One such example is Léon Gaultier's memoir *Siegfried et le berrichon:*

[276] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (London, 1956), p. 246-7.

parcours d'un collabo.[277] The memoir charts Gaultier's journey from service to Paul Marion at Vichy, through the Milice and Waffen SS, to imprisonment and national indignity after the war. However, this work has been criticised for its fractured narrative, which displays a series of disconnected events 'devoid of any serious ideological reflection or personal introspection', leaving the reader still unaware of why Gaultier may have chosen collaboration, or how this path may have been justified.[278]

It is, of course, possible for the historical premise on which fictional works are based to require amendment. However, if this occurs to a work of history, meant to present a verifiable narrative representing as truthful picture of the past, it removes its fundamental reason for existence. However, Aron's *Histoire de Vichy* is now no longer read for its historical insight. Instead, its only remaining value (to the wider field of history, as opposed to the specialist who may, for example, wish to write a biography of Aron) lies within its use as a piece of historical evidence which can allow us to examine the development of the historiographical argument about wartime France.

In terms of style, these examples of history and autobiography also contrast noticeably with fiction. Whilst the traditional novel format of the simple narrative remains in use, a wide variety of styles have developed from this, meaning there are now available to the novelist a wide variety of formats in which they can present their narrative. Fictional narratives themselves have been traditionally presented through media such as novels, short stories, fairy tales, plays, and poems, but they

[277] Léon Gaultier, *Siegfried et le berrichon: parcours d'un collabo* (Paris: Perrin, 1992).
[278] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 72.

now also encompass media such as films and comic books. These narratives in turn can use a variety of differing styles, either singularly or in any number of combinations, to tell their stories. The varieties that can be employed are myriad, but can include narratives told by a fictional narrator, or from an alternative point of view within or without the novel, though employment of allegories or symbolism, or even altered punctuation, word choice or sentence structure to convey meaning. One such less traditional fictive work is René Barjavel's *Le Voyageur imprudent*, an inventive science-fiction novel which combines a realistic account of the beginning of the war and the privations of the Occupation alongside fantastic voyages to the future and past, undertaken by the time-travelling hero of the novel with his companions.[279] Such work is clearly reminiscent of the novels of H.G. Wells, and is a more unusual representation of the Occupation, far different from anything possible in history or autobiography.[280]

Whilst authors of history and autobiography have some choices available, the constraints of the tradition of form and their specific aims means they are far more stylistically limited. The differences of style and form which fiction utilizes mean it is capable of conveying a number of generic plot styles and different stories and meanings. This has been seen in Noël Carroll's reading of Hayden White, which holds that White considers the 'number of narrative configurations available to the historian is limited'.[281] This view has been developed by Robert Holton, who asserts that, due to the narrative freedom afforded novels, they can include "jarring

[279] René Barjavel, *Le Voyageur imprudent* (Paris: Denoël, 1944).
[280] A further recent example which illustrates the ability of the novel to relate history and biography is Laurent Binet's *HHhH*, which fictionalises the verifiable story of Reinhard Heydrich's assasination in 1942. Alongside this the author also reveales his own anxieties about historical fiction. Laurent Binet, *HHhH* (Paris: Grasset, 2010).
[281] Carroll, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', p. 141.

witnesses", excluded from normal historical discourse. White believes historians wish to limit and control reality, and through this assume authority over a sense of reality. But the sense of reality 'attached to narrativity in the representation of real events arises out of a desire to have real events display the coherence, integrity, fullness, and closure of an image of life that is and can only be imaginary'.[282] Through this control, "jarring witnesses" are excluded, Holton contends. History and autobiography present a single viewpoint and narrative. Works of fiction offer more freedom: 'Instead of a single doxic view of the world, the novel, as a site for the struggle over the legitimacy, over the authority of reality, presents a heteroglot multiplicity of definitions and value judgments'.[283]

Some of the more extreme contentions put forward in these arguments will now be contested. Taking the view that there is a verifiable past, to assume that historical works have, or would assume to have, an absolute control over the reality of the past, is false. Historians deal with any evidence that they can discover, whether this discovery is deliberate or not. Historians who ignore, or, as in the case of David Irving, distort and falsify evidence, are a failure at discovering the past.[284] Instead, historians enter a dialogue with their evidence, challenging it and bringing to bear on it current theories and formulae.[285] These theories and formulae can then be used by examining the evidence through existing ideas, as well being informed and

[282] White, *The Content of the Form*, p. 24.
[283] Holton, *Jarring Witnesses*, p. 47.
[284] Irving is noted as an Hitler apologist and Holocaust denier, who 'has made a career of seeking to shift culpability for the worst atrocities from Hitler and to draw also the Allies into proximity with the outrages of the war'. Peter Baldwin, 'The "Historikerstreit" in Context' in Peter Baldwin (ed.) *Reworking the Past* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1990), p. 23. Most famously, Irving sued the American historian Deborah Lipstadt in the British High Court for libel after she accused him of deliberatly distorting evidence to support his views. Irving lost the case in 2000. See Richard J. Evan, *Lying about Hitler: history, Holocaust, and the David Irving trial* (New York: Basic Books, 2001).
[285] Evans, *In Defence of History*, p. 230.

modified in the light of new perspectives the evidence offers. Thus, valid evidence can allow any group to speak. History does not actively seek to exclude "jarring witnesses", as the growth of multicultural history, for example, shows - it is simply reliant on remaining evidence.

Holton's views do, however, correctly identify abilities that fiction possesses that are not available to history or autobiography. It is possible for fiction to represent events or figures from the past where all historical record can offer is conjecture, or an incomplete picture. The example of the *tondue* is noticeable in this respect, for as an event of recent history it is noticeably lacking in first-hand testimony by either the victims or perpetrators, due to what seems the deliberate silence of those involved. Both Virgili and Brossat's slightly earlier studies are lacking in this respect, and both authors are forced to rely on evidence such as newspaper reports and criminal records. Whilst this still allows historical study of the phenomenon, the picture it presents can seem lacking in knowledge of the human experience of those involved, especially compared with other subjects in the same period. For example, the exploits of the resistance are well documented by those involved. One example is Roger Pannequin's *Ami si tu tombes*, which describes his wartime experiences as soldier, teacher, activist and prisoner. Of particular note is the contempt displayed by Pannequin for school inspectors and administrators, magistrates and policemen who assisted the Germans in pursuing resisters but nonetheless, out of convenience, converted to Gaullism at the Liberation, and who often remained at liberty.[286]

[286] Roger Pannequin, *Ami si tu tombes* (Paris: Le Sagittaire, 1976).

It is possible for the sensitive novelist to take what is known of a period and build on that knowledge to create a picture which brings the human aspect of wider historical trends to the fore. When Croussy's *La tondue* tells the story of a woman and her son, and the effect that the event has on them and those around them, the author is building on existing knowledge of the past to add to our historical understanding through exploration of the effects such an event could have on individuals. Moreover, it is not simply that fiction can represent individuals in history through its creative abilities. It is also possible that the story of differing groups can be studied, which in turn can provide a study of the effects of history on these groups and wider society as a whole, giving a panoramic view of a particular event or period.

This ability is also open to abuse. Because fiction is not subject to the same ethical and formal constraints as history and autobiography, it can present a false image. However, that is of course radically different to stating that fiction cannot correctly depict events which took place in the past. These works can be identified and judged by the same principal means by which all three genres can be broadly distinguished: namely, the ability of external factors to delineate and give a description to history, memoir or fiction which then allows the reader to discern the genre of a narrative, as well as judging the accuracy of its contents.

Conclusion

The three genres are, at a basic level, relatively easy to identify. Because of the way they are styled, the reader can often tell whether they are faced with a work of history, autobiography or fiction, even if they know little or nothing of what the

contents describe. However, as we have seen, the three genres have common features, and, even in areas where they can be different, this is not always the case. Many novels are realistic portrayals of real events, sometimes based on personal experience. Because of this they are capable of providing reliable historical representations, which can inform readers of the past. This value is especially important for such a multifaceted event as the Occupation, whose complexity requires multiple forms of understanding and often imaginative solutions to represent it.

External factors are important in allowing the reader to judge the contents of narratives and where they fit within the genres. It would seem a fair judgment that, because of its style, the vast majority could recognize the novels contained within this thesis as fiction because they will already possess a basic conceptual framework which allows them to identify works as history, memoir or fiction. Moving to the content of the narrative presented to them, they may however not have the external knowledge that allows them to judge how far what they are told represents verifiable or reasonably assumed historical reality. If it is the case that they do not have the wider cultural knowledge to judge the work, it is, until they learn more on the subject, a fiction.

However, it may be that through factors external to the narrative they already know, or come to know, the works studied in this thesis paint a realistic picture of the Occupation that makes it a reliable representation of the events that occurred and the motivations that were in play amongst the French people at this time. This external knowledge could come from a variety of sources, such as education,

friends or relatives who were alive during the period, television documentaries, newspapers and so forth. It is possible that external factors which allow identification of a work can change, as in the case of Aron's *Histoire de Vichy*. However, even when the generic nature of a work changes because of a change in knowledge, factors external to the work itself are what force this change and locate the work and its facets within the spectrum of history, memoir and fiction. Because historical knowledge is gained from a variety of sources, novels function as repositories of historical knowledge. They are capable of appropriating techniques of history and autobiography, but also retain creative autonomy, which allows them to invent, imagine and fill gaps which exist within the historical record in a manner which mean they can still fulfil and educational role.[287] They are often explicitly didactic, allowing judgement to be made of the past. Yet they can also be judged on how effectively they communicate historical material, as well as on their imaginary experience. It is because novels can fulfil these functions that this thesis can use novels on collaboration to examine both the representations they provide, but also how they compare and contrast with the political narratives which Rousso examines.

[287] De Groot, *The Historical Novel*, p. 46.

Chapter Three: Collaboration in Daily Life

Henry Rousso's *The Vichy Syndrome* sees the period 1944-1954 as one of 'un deuil inachevé'.[288] To Rousso, the aftermath of occupation and the virtual civil war that took place during 1944-45 was also a time when France failed to come to terms with its wartime past. This was partly due to the unique nature of the total defeat of 1940 and the Occupation that followed, which seemed to forbid any form of unified myth, unlike the aftermath of the First World War. The First World War, which in itself was an event also without precedent, enabled the nation to unite around the memory of the *poilus*, immortalised in innumerable cities, towns and villages throughout France, which commemorate the million and a half dead of that war. The Second World War stood in contrast, for the official Gaullist memory, which stated that the majority either supported or were involved in resistance, was divisive, based as it was on fabrication. For this to succeed it required swift forgetting by the population of the large-scale collaboration that had taken place: that this was to prove impossible and did not in fact occur can be witnessed in literature though the novels discussed in this chapter's consideration of collaboration in everyday life.

The representation of daily life under the Occupation is unique in that it reveals the regular questions and issues that the French population faced in this period, and places them as the focus of study in light of their own experience, rather than as a context for political or ideological studies, which, as noted by Shannon Fogg, is

[288] For a full description, see Rousso, *Le syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 29-76.

often the case.[289] However, as works such as Eric Alary's *Les Français au quotidien 1939-1949* make clear, such a subject is vast in its potential scope,[290] even if study is narrowed to questions of collaboration. This chapter will therefore examine collaboration in daily life in broad terms, using three principal motivators of collaboration as identified by Philippe Burrin - *raison d'État, accommodements* and *engagement* – as overarching areas of study, whilst acknowledging these are not necessarily distinct from each other, and were subject to change as the war developed.[291]

This contrasts this chapter with later ones, which focus on smaller, yet still significant groups, which cannot claim to have involved, directly or indirectly, the whole population. Conversely, this also makes daily life both the most readily recognisable experience to the vast majority of the French people who lived through the war years, as well as representing situations and scenarios to modern readers who did not have such experiences, but who can empathise with the everyday setting. In turn, this makes collaboration in daily life a vehicle through which Rousso's political narrative can be compared and contrasted to the wartime France represented in the novels considered.

Before addressing these issues, a brief consideration of Rousso's schema will therefore be necessary. That memory of the war was divisive can be seen in a brief consideration of some of the facts and figures that Rousso utilises to make his argument. During the Second World War there were far fewer losses in France than in the preceding conflict, with approximately 600,000 fatalities. However, only

[289] Shannon L. Fogg, *The Politics of Everyday Life in Vichy France: Foreigners, Undesirables, and Strangers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 2.
[290] Eric Alary, *Les Français au quotidien 1939-1949* (Paris: Perrin, 2006), pp. 21-22.
[291] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, pp. 183-84, pp. 365-6.

around 200,000 died during military action. The other two thirds met their demise through deportation, massacre, execution, bombardment or internal combat within France or its colonies.[292] Moreover, many of these deaths were caused by the French themselves, divided by the situation in which they found themselves. The Vichy regime was complicit in the deaths of approximately 135,000 people, including 76,000 deported Jews, of whom only 3% returned.[293] The Resistance, too, was responsible for an estimated 10,000 killings.[294] During trials after the war, around 7,000 were sentenced to death but only 767 were eventually executed.[295] Issues such as these meant that it was impossible to build a unified memory of the war years based on the reality of the period, and that memories of the Occupation were bound to be fragmented.

The reality of the past was therefore difficult, but according to Gaullists needed to be presented in a manner which would allow the needs of present political unity to be met. The immediate aftermath of liberation saw a spontaneous settling of scores, with a number of summary executions. There were trials, too, with charges brought against high-profile collaborators, with politicians like Laval and the writer and intellectual Robert Brasillach executed. However, economic collaborators tended to escape: France needed its entrepreneurs and captains of industry due to the shattered state of the country's infrastructure and economy, regardless of how much

[292] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 38.
[293] André Kaspi, *Les Juifs pendant l'Occupation*, (Paris: Seuil, 1991), p. 283.
[294] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 36. As Rousso notes, this figure is in fact far below the 100,000 estimated by some at the time.
[295] For figures, see Peter Novick, *The Resistance versus Vichy*, pp. 184-187.

they may have compromised themselves during the war (a matter highlighted within Jean Dutourd's *Au Bon Beurre*).[296]

Because of the need to create the myth of a united France, issues such as the anti-Semitism of Vichy and its active compliance in the deportation of 76,000 Jews were largely ignored. Interestingly, such a position was not echoed in novels, even if in the years directly after the war the grim realities of the Holocaust were not directly represented, nor subject to deep exploration. Michel Breitman's *Fortunat ou le père adopté* is a case in point: the novel details the escape of two Jewish boys to the unoccupied zone and the relationship built with Fortunat, who has helped them escape and becomes a surrogate father to them. This relationship is damaged at the end of the war by the return of the boys' natural father, who it was believed had been killed by the Germans. Whilst this plot acknowledges the fate of the Jews, it does not focus on this issue, and through the boys' escape to the southern zone suggests Vichy was a safer option for those suffering anti-Semitic persecution.[297] As Claire Gorrara has noted, whilst novels did in fact engage with Jewish characters, such representation of the Jews was subject to continued anti-Semitism in the 1950s and 1960s, which explains such unwillingness to fully explain France's involvement.[298] Novels such as *Léon Morin prêtre*, the 1952 *Prix Goncourt*-winning novel by Béatrix Beck, illustrate this.[299] Barny, a young widow, begins a friendship with Léon Morin, a young priest, during which she decides to return to her Roman Catholic faith. The novel can be seen as providing only a

[296] One notable exception to this was Louis Renault, who was arrested at the Liberation, subsequently dying in prison. However, even in this case, the Renault Company continued production, despite its owner's conviction. Alary, *Les Français au quotidien*, p. 654.
[297] Michel Breitman, *Fortunat ou le père adopté* (Paris: Denoël, 1955).
[298] Gorrara, 'Forgotten Crimes', p. 16.
[299] Béatrix Beck, *Léon Morin prêtre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952). The novel was also made into a 1961 film of the same title, directed and scripted by Jean-Pierre Melville.

limited insight into the role of the Church during the Occupation and the moral dilemmas that this period posed to practising Catholics, and avoiding difficult questions about France's wartime role through Barny's sheltering of Jewish refugees and assistance to the Resistance.

Alongside avoidance of the Holocaust, in wider society, collaborators were judged to be traitors to France rather than French fascists, a move calculated to exclude them from the memory of the French nation and mark those involved as outsiders: the entire question of collaboration, argues Rousso, was couched in patriotic rather than political terms.[300] However, this solution was in itself imperfect, for the past could not entirely be laid to rest, and old wounds were reopened.[301] The memory and consequent marking of Nazi atrocities initially centred on crimes committed against the French, like the massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane, visited by de Gaulle in 1945, who ordered it be preserved for posterity as a memorial to Nazi aggression. Conversely, events such as the *grande rafle du Vél d'hiv'*, in which French policemen had participated, were quietly overlooked.[302] Mirroring this, remembrance of the horror of the Nazi concentration camps centred on Buchenwald, where resisters and political prisoners were held, and not Auschwitz-Birkenau, where Jews and gypsies formed the bulk of the detainees. However, this narrative, which negated widespread French involvement and focused instead on a small group of atypical French collaborators, was subject to too many tensions to be completely accepted in the long term, and it proved impossible to wholly maintain a

[300] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp.34-35.
[301] *Ibid*., pp. 75-76.
[302] The Vélodrome d'Hiver sports stadium was demolished in 1959, and the site remained without a memorial until 1993. It was here in 1995 that Jacques Chirac apologised for France's role in the Holocaust. Henry Rousso, *Vichy : L'événement, la mémoire, l'histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), p. 45.

clear line allowing the celebration of glorious or heroic actions (of the Resistance), whilst forgetting those that were shameful (the actions of collaborators).

The post-war trial of 22 soldiers of the Das Reich regiment for the massacre at Oradour is used by Rousso to illustrate this.[303] Whilst de Gaulle's 1945 visit held up the village as an example of French innocence destroyed by Nazism, the reality was more complex. The fault line in this case was geographical rather than ideological, for 14 of the 22 soldiers put on trial in 1953 were Alsatian.[304] Many Alsatians felt they had suffered enough during the war and were reluctant to see former *malgré-nous* in the dock, dragging up old memories of past crimes, whilst the relatives of those murdered at Oradour were keen to see justice done and those responsible sentenced for their crimes against unarmed civilians. The trial revealed the complexities of different forms of humiliation and suffering experienced during the Occupation, and the problems of coming to terms with what had occurred.[305] Such difficult questions were brushed over in a manner similar to the Holocaust, a full exploration of which, in novels, would have to wait until much later for discussion. Jacques Gandebeuf's 2002 *L'Accent de mon père*, in which a father from Moselle describes to his son his wartime experiences, and the difficulties of the *malgré-nous* are examples of this.[306]

This, then, according to Rousso, was the image of the past presented to France by the governing élite between 1944 and 1954, with an understanding of the past constructed for current concerns. Those who had collaborated were divided into

---

[303] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 72-75.
[304] For further information and the wider historical context see Alfred Wahl and Jean-Claude Richez, *L'Alsace entre France et Allemagne, 1850-1950* (Paris: Hachette, 1994).
[305] For general background information see Sarah Farmer, *Martyred Village: Commemorating the 1944 Massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane* (Berkeley, CA: University Of California Press, 2000).
[306] Jacques Gandebeuf, *L'Accent de mon père* (Metz: Serpenoise, 2002).

two groups. Prominent figures, guilty by the nature of their wartime positions and actions, and who were expendable, were tried as examples and labelled as traitors to France, thereby placing them outside of the body of the French nation.[307] Those who were of use, such as those who worked in industry vital for the rebuilding of France, wherever possible, had offences of collaboration negated, and quietly forgotten. As the antithesis of this, the actions of the resistance were celebrated as the true spirit of France.[308] This meant that whilst prominent collaborators were tried, and their actions admitted, many were not, and their actions in collaboration were not accepted or dealt with. Moreover, issues such as the Holocaust, which involved state and societal anti-Semitism which could not be blamed on any one or small group of individuals, was also largely overlooked.

Yet is this analysis of the period really a truthful representation of French attitudes to their wartime past in this period? Does it tally with the representation contained within novels? Initially this would appear to be the case, for Rousso's arguments have been highly influential, and certainly appear to provide a convincing analysis of the attitudes of the dominant French elites during the period. Moreover, as coverage of events such as the Holocaust suggest, there are areas of the past which are overlooked. However, it would seem that, due to the selectivity Rousso employs, he may have overestimated the inability of the French nation as a whole

---

[307] The case of Joseph Darnand, the head of the Milice, illustrates this well, for in this role he was also a member of the Waffen SS, and was condemned to death and executed in 1945. See Jean-Pierre Azéma and Olivier Wieviorka, *Vichy, 1940-1944* (Paris: Perrin, 2004), p. 332. However, Darnand's case also illustrates the difficulty of labelling collaborators as individuals outside of the French nation. Initially anti-German, Darnand was noted for his bravery against the Germans in both the First World War and the war against Germany in 1940. He also attempted to join the Resistance, but his efforts were rebuffed. For Darnand's career, see Bertram Gordon, 'Un soldat du fascisme: L'Évolution de Joseph Darnand', *Revue d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale* 108 (1977), pp. 43-70.

[308] Although, as Rousso points out, a difference was perceived between the Resistance as a whole and former individual resisters, who could be politically difficult, and many of whom were imprisoned during this period. See Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 43-44.

to look at its actions and its involvement with the occupying forces during the war years. Was this really a period in which French society was showing itself to be 'incapable de résorber entièrement le traumatisme'?[309] Certainly, at a national level, high-profile collaborators could be easily dealt with, providing a focus for those who wished to see those responsible for collaboration punished; this was mirrored throughout France with summary trials and punishments during *l'épuration sauvage* of many accused of collaborating at a local level.[310] This meant that those involved in military or paramilitary, intellectual or cultural collaboration - which were small groups - could easily be targeted and dealt with as traitors who had forfeited their place in the French nation.[311] However, this leaves the issue of collaboration in daily life to be considered. By its nature, collaboration in daily life involved vast sections of the French population as observers, if not active participants. Therefore, by considering collaboration in daily life using novels as representative sources, which examine both the perception and affective aspects of the period's events, it will be possible to reveal if the French were really so incapable of coming to terms with its past immediately after the war, or instead had an understanding of their recent history in a form which did not fully match that of the élites of the period described by Rousso. Did novels instead reveal a far greater willingness to accept collaboration as an active force in daily life during the Occupation, and that the majority of the post-war population were well aware of this?

[309] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 29.
[310] Cointet, *Expier Vichy*, p.113 – 124.
[311] For intellectual and cultural collaboration, and military and paramilitary collaboration, see chapters four and five.

The Novels and their Authors

The primary works that will be used to examine these issues are Jean-Louis Bory's *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* (1945), Marcel Aymé's *Le Chemin des écoliers* (1946), Jean-Louis Curtis' *Les Forêts de la nuit* (1947) and Jean Dutourd's *Au Bon Beurre* (1952), which are all prominent novels that portray the war years in France. Both *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* and *Les Forêts de la nuit* won the coveted *Prix Goncourt* in the years they were published, whilst Dutourd's hit *Au Bon Beurre* was also considered a likely winner in 1952, and its success can be measured by its securing of Dutourd's financial position.[312] Aymé was also a well-established and successful author.[313] It can therefore be seen that through critical and public acclaim, the representations of the war given in these authors' novels gained a wide currency, even if Curtis' *Les Forêts de la nuit* proved controversial due to its negative representation of the resistance.[314]

That the authors could comment on the war years was based partly on the shared historical and cultural knowledge they gained by being in France in the aftermath of the war, and partly on their own wartime experiences. Bory was conscripted in 1939, before continuing his education in Paris from 1942.[315] Curtis was mobilized in 1939, and at the beginning of 1940 volunteered for the air force, which in May 1940 took him to Morocco. Once he was demobilised in September he returned to France, where he became a teacher. In August 1944 he joined the *Corps franc Pommiès*, and was later part of the army of occupation in Germany. Like Bory and

[312] Kay Chadwick, *Au Bon Beurre: Scenes de la vie sous l'Occupation* (Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Publications, 2003), p. 2.
[313] Although Aymé did not always enjoy critical success, he enjoyed the role of a non-conformist. Graham Lord, *Marcel Aymé* (Berne: Peter Lang, 1987), pp. 16-19
[314] Alan Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 18.
[315] Daniel Garcia, *Jean-Louis Bory* (Paris: Flammarion, 1991), pp. 42-44.

Curtis, Dutourd did have some military experience, serving in the army. However, his active career was short; he was taken prisoner fifteen days after the invasion in 1940. He escaped six weeks later and returned to Paris where he studied philosophy at the Sorbonne.[316] Whilst these authors' experiences do broadly match (some wartime military experience followed by work in some form of education, leading to post-war literary careers), Aymé does not conform to this pattern. He was 38 in 1940, so avoided military service, and remained in Paris throughout the Occupation, where he continued his existing literary career. In fact, Aymé wrote for the collaborationist press, although his works themselves were neutral as they failed to engage with the contemporary political situation, his reputation tainted only by the journals in which they appeared.[317] Indeed, despite his work appearing in journals such as *Je suis partout* and *La Gerbe*, he avoided inclusion on *la liste noire des écrivains*, published at the Liberation.[318]

The novelists selected therefore all had experience of wartime France, and can be seen to be addressing an audience that had 'just emerged from the bewilderment, privations and bitter political divisions of the German Occupation'.[319] None was known to be attached, politically, to either collaboration or resistance, so it would seem plausible that overt political statements were not motivating factors in the writing of their novels.[320] Instead, their works should be seen as attempts to

[316] For Dutourd's own memoir of his military career and subsequent imprisonment and escape, see Jean Dutourd, *Les taxis de la Marne* (Paris : Gallimard, 1956).
[317] Marcel Aymé, *Écrits sur la politique (1933-1967)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres/Archimbaud, 2003), p. 175.
[318] Michel Lécureur, *Marcel Aymé: un honnête homme* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres/Archimbaud, 1997), p. 253.
[319] S. Benyon John, 'The Ambiguous Invader: Images of the German in some French Fiction about the Occupation of 1940-44' *Journal of European Studies* (1986) 16, pp. 187-188.
[320] It could be suggested that Aymé's defence of Robert Brasillach indicated sympathy with collaboration. However, Aymé's commentary was part of a wider literary condemnation of his death sentence, and in this he was supporting Resistance member and author François Mauriac, who circulated a petition to De Gaulle calling on him to commute the punishment.

represent and comment on the times and places they describe. These, with the stories told, are a representational cross-section of daily life in France during the period, although it should be noted that the unoccupied zone does not figure as the main setting for any of the stories,[321] or else, as in Breitman's *Fortunat ou le père adopté*, is used as a device to highlight the situation in the occupied zone.

Aymé's *Le Chemin des écoliers* takes place wholly in 1942, although the author's somewhat unusual use of footnotes reveals the post-war fate of many of the characters in the novel. *Le Chemin des écoliers* is a tableau of life for ordinary Parisians during the Occupation, and forms the second part of a socio-political trilogy covering France before, during and after the conflict (with *Travelingue* examining the Popular Front years and *Uranus* the fate of collaborators and other compromised individuals after liberation).[322] The two principal characters are Michaud (a letting agent) and his younger son Antoine (a sixteen-year-old schoolboy, who at the outset of the novel is, unbeknownst to his family, a successful black-marketeer and lover to Yvette, wife of a prisoner of war). Characters surrounding these individuals include Michaud's wife, elder son and younger daughter, his business partner Lolivier, and Lolivier's wife and sadist son. The story charts the route of Michaud to final acceptance of the reality and compromise of the Occupation after his discovery and involvement in his son Antoine's secret life, a story which explores the physical, moral and psychological

[321] This is suggestive of a response to the war years. Post-1945, the memory of an unoccupied zone would appear distant, and be overshadowed by the 1942 occupation of the whole of France. The 'safety' of the *zone libre* remained a theme in other works: Joseph Joffo's autobiographical novel *Un sac de billes* relates the flight of two Jewish boys from Paris through the South of France, to Savoie, and their attempts to avoid arrest and deportation. A humorous albeit sentimental story, it provides an interesting insight into daily life under the Occupation and its impact on children. The role of the Church and the *Chantiers de Jeunesse* in protecting Jewish children is also examined. (Joseph Joffo, *Un sac de billes* (Paris: Jean-Claude Lattès, 1973).

[322] For a broad discussion of these novels, see Dieter Müller, *Discours réaliste et discourse satirique – l'écriture dans les romans de Marcel Aymé* (Genève: Champion-Slatkine, 1993).

pressures that were brought to bear on the average Frenchman, and how he reacted to them.[323] Although it can be said that the plot is not primarily concerned with collaboration, the novel does show the pervasive nature of collaboration in Parisian life, with a subtext of minor figures who, revolving around the principal characters, create a wider impression of the Occupation,[324] and provide an insight into the material, moral and mental influences that induced some into collaboration. Many of these characters are incidental figures who appear fleetingly, and have stories detailed through footnotes, giving the impression that the central characters are simply a few amongst many.[325]

Similarly, Dutourd's Parisian-set *Au Bon Beurre* is not directly concerned with collaboration, but again shows the pervasive nature of collaboration on daily life, and the private motivations that could lead to implicit or tacit support for it. The story primarily focuses on the Poissonard family, and charts their story from the Exodus to the Liberation, recounting the growth (by means that can be described as at least immoral) of the business of Charles-Hubert, a grocer, and his wife Julie. Their story intertwines at points with that of the naively idealistic Léon Lécuyer, who provides a foil for the cynical and immoral Poissonards.[326] Lécuyer is denounced by Julie in 1940 as an escaped prisoner-of-war, and is next witnessed by the Poissonard family on a visit to Vichy being arrested after a highly ineffective attempt to assassinate Laval. Their final meeting occurs after the war. By this time, Léon's resistance activities have earned him a teaching position at one of Paris's

[323] Lord, *Marcel Aymé* p. 75.
[324] Müller, *Discours réaliste et discourse satirique*, p.173.
[325] Philippe Dufresnoy, 'La Guerre dans l'oeuvre de Marcel Aymé', *Le Cahier Marcel Aymé* (1984) 3, pp. 45-46.
[326] Chadwick, *Au Bon Beurre*, p. 71.

best schools. However, cynicism and immorality once again win out, for when Léon fails the Poissonards' son at school, their influence earns him dismissal.

Both novels focus on a small set of central characters, with many incidental ones surrounding them. Both *Les Forêts de la nuit* and *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* take a wider focus, charting the activities of a range of individuals throughout their narratives. *Les Forêts de la nuit* focuses on the town of Saint-Clar, in the Gers department, from November 1942 until the Liberation, thus making this the only one of the four novels to be set primarily in a part of France that had been in the unoccupied zone.[327] Although the de Balansun family (primarily the Comte de Balansun, his son Francis, and daughter Hélène) provide a focus for the story, a range of characters revolve around them and have their own stories, up to the point of liberation, which allows a variety of attitudes (and motivations) towards collaboration to be explored. Francis de Balansun engages in minor resistance activities, which in turn persuades his father of the value of resistance and imbues in him a deep dislike of Vichy, of which he had previously been a vocal supporter. Francis meets his end at the hands of Vichy's state police, and in particular a gang that includes Philippe, a young man from Saint-Clar who has become Hélène's lover.

The wide selection of characters in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* illustrates life in a fictional village south of Paris in 1944, although the location was based on

[327] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 9. Gers was in the unoccupied zone until November 1942, and the novel explicitly starts on 'une journée de novembre 1942' (p.5). As the Germans are present from the start of the novel and the occupation occurring is not mentioned, it must be assumed that this is a day at some point after 11 November of that year.

Bory's birthplace of Méréville in the Ile de France.[328] Whilst the three previous novels have, to a greater or lesser extent, a family providing central narrative cohesion, this is a device missing from *Mon Village*. Indeed, the novel can be seen to be a realistic tale of a village in the spring and early summer of 1944, with some characters linked only through their living in the village.[329] In the sense that the novel is a study of provincial life, it is redolent of Robert Gildea's historical study of life in the Loire Valley, which also examines issues such as sexual relations with the Germans and the role of the Roman Catholic Church.[330] The story, whilst recounted by an outside narrator, is primarily focused on those taking part in the story, and these 'eyewitness' accounts often overlap, giving different impressions and explanations for various events. Indeed, these descriptions are not limited to human eyes. The village schoolmaster's dog is given some dialogue by Bory, as is, importantly, the village itself. [331] By allowing the village to take a narrative role, Bory illustrates the importance of the location as the stage on which differing individuals' lives are carried out, displaying the struggles and individual responses and interactions in light of the events of 1944.[332]

Reasons of State

Whilst the vast majority of people were not directly involved in political collaboration, either via Vichy or the Paris-based collaborationists, political issues remain an important, if not predominant, theme within novels, with reasons of state

[328] Michael L. Berkvam, *Writing the Story of France in World War II – Literature and Memory 1942-1958* (New Orleans, LA: University Press of the South, 2000), p. 115.
[329] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance*, p. 183.
[330] Gildea, *Marianne in Chains*, pp. 76-78, 206-209.
[331] This narrative style may be inspired by Aymé's 1933 *La Jument verte*, which is narrated in the third person, interspersed with first person narratives from the eponymous green mare. Marcel Aymé, *La Jument verte* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972).
[332] Garcia, *Bory*, p. 47.

being used by collaborators to justify the policy of collaboration. As Richard Cobb has noted, for most people, private life was more important than the public sphere.[333] This has therefore led to a position where, within novels, the actuality of wider war-time situations are often obliquely acknowledged, without being explicitly stated, which points to the authors' expectations that readers would understand the wider context in which their localised stories were set.

If, as Cobb points out, private life is more important, this suggests that some unpalatable matters would have been ignored. This moral of 'blindness' can most clearly be seen in relation to the Holocaust. Within *Le Chemin des écoliers*, Michaud, as a letting agent, is quite willing to carry out the instructions of the *Commissariat général aux questions juives*, and indeed does not believe that anything seriously unfortunate can be affecting Jews deported to the East, refusing to believe one of his Jewish tenants is in any danger. However, in this case, it can be seen that Michaud is not being greedy, but is simply unaware of the true nature of what is occurring.[334] This illustrates a change of style, for whereas Michaud's lack of worldly knowledge is elsewhere a source of humour, and underlines the need for knowledge in success, his unwillingness to accept the fate of the Jews is presented as being sadly reasonable. To underline this, the Jewish character Lena, to whom Michaud rents a flat, is presented as eccentric and paranoid. Whilst any post-war reader would have been aware of the distressing truth of her fears, within the context of the book, the widespread lack of belief in her ideas appears

[333] Richard Cobb, *French and Germans, Germans and French: a personal interpretation of France under two occupations, 1914-1918 and 1940-1944* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1983), pp. xi–xiii.
[334] Jean-Paul Angelelli 'La France de 1940 à 1945 à travers les romans de Marcel Aymé' *Le Cahier Marcel Aymé* (1984), p. 59.

unfortunately plausible, showing as it does a willingness to carry out the state's bidding, and individuals' desires to cling to order in such a confusing period.[335]

Michaud's blindness to the state's activities is presented as innocence. However, greed, selfishness, and the ability, where necessary, to exclude oneself from the consequences of self-interest are also regularly evident in the representations of 'legitimate' business. In *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, Boudet is concerned with making as much money as possible out of the Germans, regardless of wider considerations. In a section narrated by him, which clearly marks his attitude as one of greed, his plan to sell last year's beans as new to the local commander for a thousand francs is revealed, as well as his wish to 'refiler' his cabbages on to the German interpreter. Within this passage, Boudet's selfishness is highlighted by the fact that it is an internal monologue, and one in which his own self is continually referenced through the use of 'je'; others only appear in his thoughts when they can be of use to him. Indeed, Boudet even admits that that he does not want the war to end straight away, as it is too profitable to him: such a desire highlights the fact that the war allowed individuals to emerge from the gutter to make great profit through business and the black market.[336] This important theme of self-interest is present in other parts of the novel; even the anonymous campaign of molestation against the shopkeeper Lécheur for his economic collaboration does not dissuade him from continuing to trade with the Germans (which in turn explains his symbolic name).

[335] Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton**,** *Vichy France and the Jews* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 145.
[336] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, p. 278.

However, not all black market activities were carried out with such a deliberate disregard for the fate of France. In *Le Chemin des écoliers*, Antoine and his friend Tiercerlin's black market operations are represented as relatively harmless, and are treated in a lightly comic fashion, with motivations above pure greed: indeed, Antoine's main motivation is to maintain his lover Yvette. Moreover, their business is never represented as benefiting either the French or the Germans, and is never condemned either by the protagonists or by the novel's omniscient intrusive narrator. Indeed, the black market is shown to be fairly widespread, and Antoine and Ticerlin's attitudes guide the reader to appreciate its appeal.[337] Coming of age during the war, their approach seems to be that the black market is a fact of life that cannot be escaped, and Aymé's story leads the reader to a similar conclusion. The only aspect of their trade which serves to remind the reader of the specific wartime nature of the black market is the final deal which serves to make Antoine the fortune that his father then invests in his own business. This involves the two schoolboys selling between them a somewhat unbelievable five thousand coffins, which meant 'on sort un peu du chocolat et des délices de Madame', but which would sell well in the period, bringing Antoine seven-hundred and fifty thousand francs.[338] Whilst the figure of five thousand seems far-fetched and unrealistic, the blackly comedic situation is a reminder of the serious nature of warfare, and serves as a reminder of the creation of wealth through death. Moreover, although their activities are presented as morally ambiguous, their links to both death and the Germans point to the relative ease through which individuals could be linked to

[337] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 17.
[338] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 135.

collaboration.[339] This is particularly the case in cities, which were themselves considered to be far more likely to foster collaboration than the countryside, more readily linked to the resistance.

Beyond greed, political opinion (in the wider, non-party sense), was also an important part of everyday life, although as the novels make clear, these views were by no means static throughout the war, with popular support for Vichy diminishing as the war continued.[340] Curtis takes a sceptical view of this change in the allegiance of the French people. Commenting on Pétain, he represents the Marshal as enjoying esteem during the early part of his regime. However, 'par la suite, son prestige décrut, à une allure de plus en plus accélérée, à mesure qu'on se rapprochait de la libération. En août 44, la sympathie envers le Maréchal s'était tellement amenuisée que son portrait tomba de lui-même dans toutes les maisons, pour être remplacé par celui du général de Gaulle'.[341] As Jonathan Judaken has pointed out, the world looked very different after key turning points in the war.[342]

Whilst some opinions undoubtedly changed from personal conviction, this development may have also occurred because of pragmatic reasons due to the date used. Moreover, the passage also disparages the change of support from Pétain to de Gaulle: although Pétain's portrait may have fallen off the wall, indicating this was a natural process, and that those who carried out such an act would wish such an act to go without notice, the style of the passage leaves the reader in no doubt that, in reality, it was a political decision based not on ideological choice but on

[339] It should also be noted that the Germans made officially sponsored purchases on the black market up until 1943 through German agents. German involvement also continued after official endorsement was removed, indicating how easily involvement in the black market could be seen a s a form of collaboration. Vinen, *The Unfree French*, p. 220.
[340] Pierre Laborie, *L'Opinion Français sous Vichy* (Paris: Seuil, 1990), pp. 328–329.
[341] Curtis *FdlN*, p. 213.
[342] Judaken, 'Intellectuals, Culture and the Vichy Years', pp. 84-85.

necessity. Such decisions can be seen in analyses of public opinion. Whilst it may have been the case that many French people were hoping for a British victory from the autumn of 1940, in practice, in outward political views as well as political actions, for the majority of the population, *attentisme* was the order of the day.[343]

In wider public opinion, there was a gradual change in opinions from favourable to unfavourable impressions of collaboration which took place over the four-year period; however, a general tipping-point of change can be placed late in 1942. The unseen narrator of *Au Bon Beurre* informs the reader that 'en 1942, qu'on s'en souvienne, l'esprit de résistance n'était pas fort répandu, et la plupart des Français acceptaient le gouvernement de Vichy pour ce qu'il se donnait'.[344] After this, acceptance of Vichy appears to slip away. Curtis, in *Les Forêts de la nuit*, presents the most lucid demonstration of a change of support away from collaboration, although such changes of support are a rarity as a phenomenon in the novels (suggestive that novelists believed their readership could contextualise their stories to the period in which they were set). At the beginning of the story, M. de Balansun is a committed supporter of the Marshal, but after being persuaded of the nobility of his son's resistance activity, becomes a staunch Gaullist. Most characters remain unchanged in their political allegiance, however, or hedge their support as they wait for future events to unfold, as in the case of Darricade, a character represented as constantly mindful of his later career to the point of being contemptible; as Curtis points out, there were many new patriots at the Liberation. Certainly, these representations provide a broadly accurate portrayal of shifting opinions, even if

[343] Sweets, John F., *Choices in Vichy France: The French under Nazi Occupation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 168-169. *Attentisme* is defined as a 'wait-and-see attitude'. See Judaken, 'Intellectuals, Culture and the Vichy Years', p. 84.
[344] Dutourd, *ABB*, p. 200.

Curtis' representation simplifies the change for narrative purposes. The unpopularity of Vichy can be seen as growing throughout 1941, with 1942 (notably the occupation of the southern zone) being a key point of change, although even such a change did not mean unequivocal support for resistance in 1943.[345] Moreover, in terms of opinion, Curtis also sees that the war has created more division than unity.[346]

However, despite such cynical representations of changing public support for collaboration, or at least *attentisme*, static private views towards Vichy can be gauged. The *Service du travail obligatoire* was an unpopular policy which did the regime much harm. Another unpopular aspect of the Vichy government was the Milice, created in 1943, and shown in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* to have become extremely unpopular by 1944. Pluret refers to them sarcastically as 'la crème', and they are represented as bad news: general conversation condemns then, as they are 'pire que les Boches', who at least fight for their own country.[347] As Margaret Atack points out, the use of French paramilitary forces by the Germans distorts the 'otherness' of the enemy that had, until then, been present.[348] This point, along with the language used to describe the Milice and its activities, leaves the reader in no doubt as to why the Milice could never gain any measure of public support, and the extremely negative light in which it was held.[349]

Whilst the novels discuss the waning popularity of the Vichy government, discussion of individual government members does not occur, although Laval is the

[345] Flonneau 'L'évolution de l'opinion publique', pp. 520-521.
[346] Angela Kershaw, 'History of a success: Irène Némirovsky's posthumous reputation, 1944-2004' *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 4 (2011), p. 86.
[347] Bory, *MV*, pp. 353-354.
[348] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance*, pp. 178-179.
[349] Pierre Giolitto, *Histoire de la milice* (Paris: Perrin, 1997), pp. 253-254.

subject of a naive and botched assassination attempt in *Au Bon Beurre*. Primary focus therefore rests on Pétain, seen as the object of some reverence among those who support both the Marshal and his policies: Pétain was seen as the key figure for uniting the nation.[350] The trust placed in the Marshal after the Armistice can be seen in *Au Bon Beurre*. He is represented as a wise and cunning man, who would ultimately save France, and is quite capable of playing the 'double game' of working with the Germans, but also protecting France's interests.[351] This form of support, and the celebrity cult surrounding the Marshal, is ultimately seen in the Poissonard's visit to Vichy for an audience to present the Marshal with hens' eggs, which for a time leads to them becoming local celebrities in their native Paris, and convinced supporters of Pétain.[352] However, the incident is written in a humorous manner, which can be seen as a parody of the propaganda of the writer René Benjamin, with the Marshal also greeting the expected delegations of workers and Scouts, offering those who have come to see him the vague greetings of an old man out of touch with reality. Whilst Pétain remained revered, by 1942 his image on newsreels was no longer applauded in cinemas, with his reputation resting on the legend of his past efforts, rather than his present role.[353]

Yet, he is still admired by those visiting, although they are portrayed as being as foolish as the Marshal is. This does not mean his support is not widespread, however, and incidents in the books indicate the esteem in which he is held. Chou, the young daughter of Michaud's son's lover in *Le Chemin des écoliers* recites a prayer before bed, part of which asks God to preserve the Marshal's life, indicative

[350] Laborie, *L'Opinion française sous Vichy*, p. 256.
[351] Marc Ferro in 'Le Fonctionnement opinion sous Vichy', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992), pp. 257-258.
[352] See Gérard Miller, *Les pousse au jouir du Marechal Pétain* (Paris: Seuil, 1975).
[353] Laborie, *L'Opinion publique*, p. 257.

of the paternalistic image of Pétain the regime attempted to propagate.[354] Treatment of the Marshal as a father figure is a common theme in the novels, as elsewhere. The short story *Le Pétainiste* by Pierre Siniac, for example, examines the reverence in which he is held by a First World War veteran, whose experiences of that conflict have led him to support the Marshal's collaboration.[355] In *Les Forêts de la nuit*, portraits of the Marshal are a regular feature in people's homes, and often referred to. Moreover, their symbolism is reinforced by the dislike they inspire in M. de Balansun. Balansun removes the portrait he had in his own home, also insisting the portrait be removed from a house he visits, although the maid, again indicating the reverence the Marshal is held in, insists on retaining the portrait to hang in her own room. The portrait again can be seen in the *salles des Fêtes* later in the novel, which is dominated by 'un Maréchal immense sur le mur',[356] symbolising his predominance in everyday life during the period as the perceived saviour of the nation, a role discussed elsewhere in the novel.[357]

Accommodations

Many individuals had to interact with the Germans on some level, and thereby sought to come to a form of accommodation with the occupiers: there were multiple points of contact between the Germans and the French population, which involved both chance meetings as well as the interactions necessary for professional relations. However, whilst this means it is therefore impossible to divorce these people from confirmed collaborators (or resisters), it must be remembered that they

[354] Roger Austin, 'The Educational and Youth Policies of the Vichy Government in the Department of Hérault, 1940-1944' (Ph.D., University of Manchester, 1981), p. 330.
[355] Pierre Siniac, *L'unijambiste de la cote 284* (Paris: Gallimard, 1980).
[356] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 291.
[357] Pétain's reputation is however shown differently later in the war in Louis Malle's film *Lacombe Lucien*. Set late in the Occupation in June 1944, the *Gestapistes* in the film use a photo of the Marshal for target practice, and refer to him as 'le vieux cul'.

were ordinary people engaged in everyday life, in which the struggle for survival was often the greatest concern.[358] This form of collaboration was therefore often driven by some form of need or necessity, and was influenced by the changed circumstances the war brought, which required codes of practice different from those of peacetime.

This can be seen in the attitude towards economic collaboration of *Au Bon Beurre*, in a passage that displays through a cynical matter-of-fact style the depressing reality of the changing circumstances of the Occupation:

> Tout était bouleversé. En 1941, que restait-il de raisonnable dans les commandements de l'honnêteté commerciale ? C'étaient des données périmées. L'honnêteté commerciale n'est point un corps de préceptes moraux, mais un ensemble de recettes pour obtenir le succès. En temps normal, elle se définit par des maximes de ce genre : «Les bons produits font les boutiques prospères.» Mais on n'était plus en temps normal. Malhonnête, jadis, un commerçant faisait faillite ; honnête, aujourd'hui, il se ruinait.[359]

Because of the shortage of supplies, money could be made through illegal or suspect trade. The Poissonards in *Au Bon Beurre*, Boudet in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, and Michaud in *Le Chemin des écoliers* all grow rich through trade which at the very least benefits from the Occupation in some way. The Poissonards cheat their customers and trade with the Germans, as does Boudet. Michaud does attempt to carry out 'honest' trade, but remains poor for his efforts. A change in his circumstances is only brought about by his discovery of his son's black market activities. This brings him a large amount of money, and he finally sees his

[358] Shannon L. Fogg, *The Politics of Everyday Life in Vichy France – Foreigners, Undesirables, and Strangers* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 189.
[359] Dutourd, *ABB*, p. 118.

previous business practice is both out of step with the times and unprofitable, so he invests the windfall he gains from his son in various in-demand goods and grows rich. All of these accounts are written in a style which underlines the moral ambiguity of such situations, and in both *Au Bon Beurre* and *Le Chemin des écoliers* satire is used to this end.[360] However, although the new-found wealth of the protagonists is treated with mockingly indignant amusement, such passages are also informative in a manner which tempers this, for, despite these factors those involved have survived the war, and survived well.

Nonetheless, within this grudging admiration for survival the authors do still invoke the moral judgement of the reader. Whilst the Poissonards' willing involvement in dubious business activities engenders a certain moral repugnance, Michaud's practices are not presented to the reader as objectionable. Michaud, if not an overly attractive character, is not unappealing, and Aymé does show him attempting to justify his activities. However, this morality in turn frustrates the reader, for his character's inability to recognise that the world has fundamentally changed (and his suffering for this) is an important theme in the work. Only those able to recognise this can succeed. Therefore, when Michaud belatedly enters the black market it is a long-needed action that finally brings financial reward to his and his family's existence, and marks his recognition of the black market's 'ubiquitous presence' in Aymé's chronicling of Occupation.[361]

Michaud's final induction into the realities of the wartime economy is therefore not matched by the Poissonards, who embrace the new situation that occupation brings

[360] Chadwick, *Au Bon Beurre*, p. 29; Lord, *Marcel Aymé*, p. 79.
[361] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 183.

from its start. The Poissonards are not sympathetic characters, being greedy and self-interested, and illustrate well that war, for some, was good business. These are, however, characteristics which are shown to allow them to navigate the economic world well, and take advantage of it. In the early part of the war, Charles-Hubert decides to sell butter, eggs, cheese and milk to the Germans. Julie worries this may harm their reputation, but her worries are dismissed as it appears at this point the Germans will win the war, and they can always claim that they were forced if circumstances change. Not only will they be able to establish an economic relationship with the winning side, but they will also benefit from what the Germans can provide them with (permits, tyres, cameras, tobacco, travel permits). The only disadvantage to this plan, in a humorous addition which emphasises the Poissonards' greed, is that Charles-Hubert tells his wife about the concept in bed, the excitement of which prevents her from sleeping. Self-interest eventually overrides this greed, however. When Charles-Hubert finally succeeds in providing for the Germans he soon realises that, despite the material benefits, the risks are too great, so he manages to extricate himself from the arrangement. Perhaps the one over-riding factor which allows the Poissonards to act as they do is their lack of emotional range or depth, which Dutourd portrays throughout the work as he details their activities with a straightforward frankness.[362] The characters therefore elicit no sympathy on the reader's part, but nonetheless flourish in a situation where survival is of the ultimate importance in a society denuded of selflessness.

[362] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 26. Dutourd himself altered his view of the past and the Poissonard's typicality in the novel's subtitle: in the 1981 edition of his novel Dutourd changed this from 'Dix ans de la vie d'un crémier', which focuses on Charles-Hubert, to the wider-encompassing 'Scènes de la vie sous l'Occupation'. Sonia Spurdle, 'Food for Thought in Jean Dutourd's *Au Bon Beurre*' *Romance Studies* 7 (1989), p. 44.

The unappealing nature of the Poissonards is mirrored in other accounts of business, as the visit of Gérard and Hélène to a Parisian restaurant in *Les Forêts de la nuit* illustrates. The affluent clientele consist of young people who resemble Hollywood stars, and 'les hommes avaient le genre rastaquouère-qui-a-réussi. La veulerie et la rapacité se partageaient ces joues bien nourries'.[363] For this group, the 'fin 40 avait été l'aurore de l'âge d'or'.[364] Regarding this situation, the narrator, in a matter-of-fact and accepting style, cannot help commenting that it is difficult to draw the conclusion that France did not deserve its fate. However, the narrator also points out that the situation was not that simple, as the undeserving who gained a little produce from any 'cul-terreux millionnaire' surely did not deserve the same fate.[365] This final point further emphasises the greed and self-interest of those who significantly profited from the Occupation.

Important to the operation of greed and the ability to deal with changed circumstances is the ability to forget the fate of those unable to benefit economically from the Occupation. The fate of the Jews, mentioned above, is the prime example of cultivated ignorance. Julie's treatment of Josette, her assistant, illustrates the application of this through Josette's economic suffering and enslavement to Julie.[366] Whilst the Poissonards gorge themselves on pâté and rice pudding at lunch, Josette is given cabbage and turnips, a regular feature of life for large sections of the population under the Occupation.[367] Through ironic humour, Dutourd shows Julie is tricking herself, for whilst she fails to notice Josette's half-starved glances at their food, she is shrewd enough to ensure Josette is henceforth

[363] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 120.
[364] *Ibid*., p. 120.
[365] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 120.
[366] Patrick Gofman, *Jean Dutourd* (Monaco: Rocher, 1994), p. 39.
[367] Alary, *Les Français au quotidien*, pp. 251-252.

fed before the family, to ensure she has no appetite. Such representation of shortage, highlighted by the Poissonards' 'odious' behaviour, helps provide a realistic quality to the novel.[368] Food shortages form a regular part of Occupation novels, such as *Turne 3*, in which one of the main characters turns their chateau into a farm to help ease food shortages[369], and François Nourissier's *Allemande*, where food shortage is one of the most notable effects of the war,[370] and illustrate justifiable reasons why people would seek accommodations with the Germans. As John F. Sweets has noted of his study of Clermont-Ferrand, if collective memory of the war years could be reduced to one word, it would be 'la disette'.[371]

This point emphasises, as the novels show, that the black market was not necessarily either an act of collaboration or morally ambiguous. In *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, Marcel's father disapproves of his son taking part in such activities, and worries about the consequences, but as Marcel comments in an internal monologue about his father, 'il n'y a pas de différence entre le marché noir honnête et l'autre',[372] indicating the black market was not necessarily a force which benefited either collaborators or the Germans. This point is further expanded in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*. Living next door to Lécheur, who willingly economically collaborates, is M. Peigne, the cobbler. When he is denounced by Lécheur for black market activity, Germaine defends his activity: 'Marché noir? Ce que faisait Peigne? Si on l'avait pas eu, on crevait de faim, oui, avec leurs tickets. Il n'a jamais fait payer trop cher. Non. Il y en avait pour tout le monde, et lui, au moins, il servait les Français. C'est pas comme d'autres qui réservent toutes leurs

[368] Spurdle, 'Food for Thought, p. 101.
[369] Noële Edmond-About, *Turne 3* (Paris: Sociales Françaises, 1945).
[370] François Nourissier, *Allemande* (Paris: Grasset, 1973).
[371] Sweets, *Choices in Vichy France*, p. 8.
[372] Bory, *MV*, p. 45.

chatteries pour les gueules de qui je pense'.[373] The consensus seems to be that Peigne, unlike others, was running a beneficial and fair black market for the French. Indeed, as has been argued, on a national level the black market was vital for the economy and important for the survival of many people.[374]

However, it would be wrong to cast the black market in an truly altruistic light, for it was primarily a mechanism by which personal needs could be met. This expedient approach of accommodation was readily adopted by many in daily life in their regular social interactions with the Germans, either because it was in their self-interest to do so, because they simply wanted to, or because they did not care that those with whom they were socialising were the enemy. In *Au Bon Beurre*, the morally-vacuous Charles-Hubert points out that the Germans' behaviour is formal and polite, a view that still held some sway even by 1943.[375] According to Charles-Hubert, this entitles them to some respect, and that people should therefore make an effort to get along with them: 'Moi je comprends pas les gens qui rouspètent parce que les Allemands ont fusillé quinze types. Ces quinze types-là ils avaient qu'à rester tranquilles. On les a fusillés, c'est bien fait pour eux. Ils ne servaient qu'à attirer des ennuis aux autres. Les Allemands ont eu raison de les fusiller. Ils sont les vainqueurs, ils ne veulent pas qu'on les emmerde. Si on était à leur place, on en ferait autant. Si tout monde faisait comme dit le père Pétain, ça irait mieux'.[376]

This passage presents, in a relaxed and matter-of-fact fashion, the attitude of acceptance that the war was lost, and that respecting the occupying forces was the

[373] *Ibid.,* pp. 145-146.
[374] Jean-Pierre Azéma, De *Munich à la Liberation: 1938 – 1944* (Paris: Seuil, 1979), p. 161 - 162. It should also be noted that a difference between micro and marco levels of black market activity exists, with a clear disparity existing between local deals and large scale profiteering. For further information, see Fabrice Grenard, *La France du marché noir (1940-1949)* (Paris: Payot, 2008).
[375] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, pp. 201-202.
[376] Dutourd, *ABB*, p. 55.

best possible option. Whilst Dutourd's depiction is satirical, and can be seen as a classic example of the 'roman antirésistancialiste',[377] the underlying attitude is illustrated in other works which do not rely on humour to make points. A dinner the Costellots give for Von Brackner, a German army officer, in *Les Forêts de la nuit*, provides a good representation of a type of social interaction which often took place during the Occupation.[378] The dinner is a pleasant affair, and 'la conversation fut animée, assez brillante'.[379] Part of the conversation revolves around joking about M. de Balansun, which both the Costellots and Von Brackner enjoy. The intimacy enjoyed is evident in the pleasure they derive from a description of M. de Balansun insisting a portrait of Pétain is thrown in the dustbin. Although there is an awkward moment during the meal when Francis (and his resistance activities) is compared to the Hitler Youth, this is immediately smoothed over.

Mme Costellot clearly enjoys the company of Von Brackner (he is their guest at their invitation), and revels in his manners. Mme Costellot never tired of seeing him clicking his heels, as befitted a man of the Prussian nobility: 'Quelle allure! Quel chic!'.[380] This personal attraction is echoed by Antoine's attitude to the collaborator Malinier in *Le Chemin des écoliers*, which also illustrates why Aymé was popular with the Right in post-war France.[381] Antoine finds that, despite Malinier's anti-Semitic and pro-collaboration views, which he himself is strongly against, Malinier's character is appealing. Antoine finds something engaging in the personality of 'cet homme violent et naïf qui acceptait d'aller mourir très loin de

[377] Christopher Lloyd, 'In the Service of the Enemy: The Traitor in French Occupation Narratives' *French Cultural Studies* 22 (2011) p. 246.
[378] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, pp. 209-210.
[379] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 234.
[380] *Ibid*., p. 237.
[381] Nicholas Hewitt, *Literature and the right in postwar France: the story of the 'Hussards'* (Oxford: Berg, 1996), p. 198.

chez lui dans un pays inconnu [USSR]'.[382] These facets are given added emphasis by their comparison with those of the retired school inspector, for although his views are correct, he is pompous and boring, and lacks the air of romance which Malinier contains, even if this romance is described in language which lends it an ironic undertone, and paints Malinier as grotesque.[383] Such 'grotesque romance' prefigures that of the real-life anti-communist Christian de la Mazière, who fought in the Waffen SS against the Russians.[384]

Socialising with the occupying forces or collaborators was not always appealing, however. Antoine's father is drunkenly combative (if slightly fearful) in conversation with a German officer he meets in a café. In the sober light of day he is appalled to think he could have been consorting with a German officer, although part of this disgust was directed at his inability to completely conceal his fear. Fear is not an emotion caused by a visit to the German-occupied Chateau in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*. Instead, boredom seems to be the dominant feeling of Frenchmen who had accepted their invitation to attend a music concert organised by the German commander. The Abbé, Boudet, and the town mayor, Morize, are lost in their own thoughts during the concert, and attend only to please the Germans, which can also be seen as a representation of the Germans' desire to parade their own culture within occupied France.[385] As the narrative makes clear, the French members of the audience are concerned with their own affairs, and it is only the German commander who enjoys the music. This seems, in part, because of the disdain they now entertain (in 1944) for the military quality of the occupying

[382] Aymé *CdE*, p. 178.
[383] Müller, *Discours réaliste et discourse satirique*, p. 217.
[384] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 210. For further discussion on this subject, see chapter six.
[385] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, pp. 351-352.

forces, given physical representation here by the German commander, whose description borders on the scatological (his face is compared to an arse by Germaine: he has 'une bouche qui attirait plus le papier de soie que le baiser').[386]

Whilst the above illustrates social interaction between collaborators and the occupying forces by considered choice, some socialised with the occupying forces without such thought, choosing instead to ignore the activities that those they dealt with may have been involved with when not in their company. In Tiercelin's father's café in *Le Chemin des écoliers* Antoine is slightly embarrassed to be found in intimate company with German officers. However, this marks him out as unusual in the company he keeps. When Antoine informs Yvette that she has been talking to a Gestapo agent, she responds 'oui, je sais, on me dit l'a déjà dit. Pour ce que j'en veux faire, c'est d'ailleurs sans importance',[387] which shocks Antoine. However, Tiercelin explains this attitude:

> S'il fallait que j'épluche la clientèle de mon père, je n'en finirais pas. Et d'ailleurs, je n'ai rien contre eux. De tous les hommes qui sont ici ce soir, ce sont probablement les plus propres, ceux que j'aimerais le mieux fréquenter. Je dirais même que j'aimerais assez leur ressembler. Note bien que je n'ai pas la prétention de formuler une opinion sur les Allemands ou sur l'hitlérisme. Je n'en ai pas et je n'ai guère envie de m'en faire une. Elle serait sûrement fausse.[388]

Such a passage points to the fact that, in social circles, life in Paris continued regardless in such cases. Moreover, Yvette's comment focuses on a particular facet of this, namely of the willingness of some to form romantic and mercenary

[386] Bory, *MV*, pp. 109-121.
[387] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 132.
[388] *Ibid*., pp. 133.

relationships with the occupying forces without thought of the wider wartime situation.[389]

This emphasis on the individual and the individual's relationship to the war is echoed in Aymé's narrative style. Through use of footnotes he describes the fate of a selection of minor or incidental characters, which creates an impression of individual stories and 'disculpates' his characters from the main storyline.[390] One of the flats Michaud manages is inhabited by M. Legrand, who is the subject of a complaint to Michaud for throwing noisy parties. Legrand rejects Michaud's remonstrance for this, as he is newly-married and in love. He acknowledges that his neighbours are furious at his behaviour, but he cannot be concerned with their cares. For Legrand, 'la France, l'Europe, la guerre et toute la misère du monde' seem to him 'd'aussi peu de poids et d'importance qu'un grain de sel dans l'Atlantique'.[391] Despite his carefree language, given added power by Michaud's world-weary nature, his fate does not allow for such continued happiness: he is denounced at the end of the Occupation for holding parties attended by collaborators. However, whilst there were great benefits to accommodating the Germans in this fashion, it should also be noted that, as the war progressed, many ordinary Germans suffered privations similar to those of the French populace as the war situation deteriorated: despite the novel's representation of a choice of suffering or working with the Germans, this was not necessarily always an option.[392]

---

[389] Patrick Buisson, *1940-1945, années érotiques: Vichy ou les infortunes de la vertu* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2008), pp. 94 – 98.
[390] Hewitt, *Literature and the Right*, p. 118.
[391] Aymé, *CdE*, pp. 84-85.
[392] Vinen, *The Unfree French*, p. 111.

Legrand, by his foolish choice of companions, opens himself to criticism, placing himself in a position where he could easily be denounced. Yet even the most circumspect accommodation could lead to charges of collaboration by those with malicious intent. Mme Delahaye, the widow of a composer in *Les Forêts de la nuit*, has a German officer, Rustiger, billeted in her house. Upon their first meeting, the old lady, for whom the author elicits the reader's sympathy by an appealing characterisation (she is described as short-sighted, absent-minded and of dreamy nature), was polite due only to good manners, until she discovers Rustiger has heard a concert of her late husband's work, and they have a shared love of music. Although M. de Balansun disapproves, even he is won over by Rustiger's conduct, agreeing that Rustiger 'était un Teuton de la bonne espèce, un fils spirituel de Goethe, égaré dans les hordes barbares du IIIe Reich'.[393] Rustiger is represented in a positive light as gentle and intelligent, a 'bon Allemand' who wishes for the defeat of his own country.[394] Despite being heavily at odds with his Nazi countrymen (given emphasis by the author's plot device, which has Rustiger sent to serve on the Russian front because of Jewish ancestry), he unwittingly provides the activity that can be turned by Mme Delahaye's embittered and troublesome former maid into a charge of collaboration at liberation. At Rustiger's departure, Mme. Delahaye kisses him on both cheeks. From this innocent and civilised relationship grows a reputation of carnal lust, based on malicious gossip, which is enough to have Mme Delahaye subject to the fury of the mob in the autumn of 1944. Such a fictionalised account is similar in severity to real-life cases. Hannah Diamond details the example of a woman who faced such mob treatment at the Liberation,

[393] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 174.
[394] Manuel Braganca 'Le 'bon Allemand' dans le roman français de l'immédiat après-Seconde Guerre mondiale: une erreur de casting?' *Modern & Contemporary France* 18 (2010), p. 336.

whose 'crime' had been to speak to a German outside her house when he was carrying out his regular patrol.[395]

Whilst such actions were, in reality, entirely innocent of romantic or sexual content, as the omniscient narrator makes clear, many such liaisons which did contain these elements occurred under the Occupation, and as the reaction to Mme Delahaye's supposed relationship illustrates, these associations were disapproved of. Indeed, 'horizontal' collaboration is a strong theme in *Les Forêts de la nuit*, *Le Chemin des écoliers* and *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* (although it interestingly does not feature to any extent in *Au Bon Beurre*). Once again, examples of this form of collaboration can be seen throughout the footnotes Aymé employs to introduce incidental characters in *Le Chemin des écoliers*. Ketty, an actress, is the mistress of a German and has her head shaved at the Liberation for this. However, she shows much of the spirit that often seems to be part of the characters of such women in the novels. When asked why she had been the mistress of a German by a commission of enquiry, she is ready with her feisty response: 'parce qu'il avait… une belle gueule et qu'il me faisait jouir. Vous, avec vos gueules de cons, vous ne me feriez pas jouir'.[396] Such a reply recalls the spirited riposte of the actress Arletty, who, when accused of consorting with German officers, commented 'Mon coeur appartient à la France, mais mon cul est international'.[397] Overall, such scenes illustrate that Aymé's work (along with the other novels considered here) tends to paint a more sympathetic picture of those accused of collaboration, whilst negating

[395] Hannah Diamond, *Women and the Second World War in France 1939 – 1948: Choices and Constraints* (Harlow: Longman, 1999), p. 135.
[396] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 69.
[397] Hannah Diamond, 'A New Dawn? French Women and the Liberation', *Women's Studies International Forum* 23 (2000), p. 734.

the heroic stance adopted by the resistance,[398] and can also be seen as the beginning of the re-emergence of collaborators into daily life.[399]

This is matched by Mme Arréguy in *Les Forêts de la nuit*. When she is dragged from her house by the resistance to have her head shaved, she struggles 'comme une diablesse', which ultimately saves her. Whilst she is guilty of sleeping with the Germans, she has also been sleeping with Darricade, a resistance figure who takes charge at the Liberation, and demands to see him, becoming 'une hyène, une panthère, une furie déchaînée'. In a speech to the assembled crowd in the committee room of the town hall (which she has stormed into, past the guard, who was 'un jeune homme malingre, qui s'était improvisé patriote le jour même', illustrating the hypocrisy of some members of the Resistance), she denigrates Darricade for his own wartime activities (building on the hypocrisy suggested by the description of the guard), which were none too heroic.[400] This earns her freedom, as her tirade causes Darricade great embarrassment, and she needs to be removed to silence her, illustrating how the war is revealed by Curtis as a catalyst for showing the inner truth of individuals and the situations they find themselves in.[401] Both Aymé's and Curtis's descriptions create an image of determined and honest womanhood, which compares favourably with the behaviour of the men of the resistance, seen as shallow and dishonest, and such passages successfully persuade the reader of this. Whilst Mme Arréguy's character may not be attractive to the reader (Curtis's use of words such as 'diablesse' are accurate), they lack the

[398] Lécureur, *Marcel Aymé*, p. 261.
[399] Michael Kelly, 'The View of Collaboration in the "Après-Guerre"' in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.) *Collaboration in France: Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989), p. 250. This is also an example of the anti-résistancialiste motif identified by Hamel in Aymé's work. See Hamel, *La Bataille des memoires*, p. 188.
[400] Curtis *FdlN*, p. 406.
[401] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance,* p. 186.

fluctuating and opportunistic standards of those who judge them. In this sense, all of the novels discussed can be seen as attacks on the double standards and opportunism that the Occupation and its aftermath caused.[402]

Many women were regarded as having benefited from the Occupation, and they were seen to enjoy the material benefits that could be 'bought' in return for their favours to men: 'maintenant, ils vivaient en plein âge d'or, la moindre grue devenue Danaé',[403] indicating, through Curtis' reference to Danaé, that they were available to the new 'gods' of the Occupation. However, at the Liberation they were subjected to 'justice' by resistance groups. Yet, although involvement with 'horizontal' collaboration is shown to be widely disapproved of by characters in the novels, it is not universally condemned, and nor is the punishment considered just in all cases. *Les Forêts de la nuit* describes the process of head-shavings, and clearly shows the proceedings were by no means just, with mob mentality targeting those who could not defend themselves, and little discernible sympathy from observers.[404]

The case of Mme Delahaye is also illustrative of this point. It is Berthe, her former maid, who leads a group of resistance men to her house, where a rabble gathers, confusing the old lady, who is then struck on the head by a stone thrown by one of the crowd. With blood trickling down her forehead (emphasising her plight), she is dragged before the three-thousand strong crowd outside the town hall. Curtis refers, via M. de Balansun, to the process by which the women were punished as 'medieval', a word which emphasises the barbaric nature of the punishment and the

[402] Marie-Claude Jardin, *Jean-Louis Bory* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1991), p. 106.
[403] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 120.
[404] Corran Laurens '"La Femme au Turban": les Femmes tondues' in H.R. Kedward and Nancy Wood (eds.) *The Liberation of France: Image and Event* (Oxford: Berg, 1995), p. 158.

mob's enjoyment of the spectacle: whilst the barber performing the shavings waved his shears, 'la foule riait de ses plaisanteries, de sa mimique', Mme Delahaye sat 'comme les criminels ou les sorciers du Moyen Age étaient exposés au pilori'.[405] Berthe's malicious nature therefore punishes a woman who is clearly not deserving of this barbaric fate, but also shows the extreme cruelty with which those accused of 'collaboration' could be treated, despite little evidence.[406]

Vindictiveness seems to be a factor that motivated those judging women who had sexual relations which the Germans, as does a necessary degree of double standards. The petty and self-centred actress wife of Lolivier, Michaud's business partner in *Le Chemin des écoliers* is a case in point. The reader is informed by the narrator that, throughout the whole of the Occupation, she has toyed with the idea of sleeping with a German officer, although never succeeds in doing so. After the Liberation she was active in getting actresses who had done so banned from the stage, illustrating the hypocrisy and malicious nature of many responsible for judging those who had romantically collaborated. This is indicative of the sexual jealousy which motivated some accusations of collaboration. As Fabrice Virgili points out, the head shavings were a direct attack on a woman's sexual and seductive being.[407]

The hypocrisy of this position is also highlighted by the authors' suggestion that it was best, under the Occupation, to take a pragmatic attitude towards sexual involvement. Aymé, in another footnote, tells the story of a beautiful woman who meets an important official in the French Gestapo. When he proposes sleeping with

[405] Curtis, *FdlN*, p. 408, p. 410.
[406] Diamond, *Women and Second World War*, pp. 135-136.
[407] Fabrice Virgili, 'Les Tontes de la Libération en France', in *Les Cahiers de l'Institut d'histoire du temps présent* 31 (1995), pp. 119-120.

her, she refuses. In a terse depiction, Aymé describes how the Gestapo official arrests her, steals her jewels and rapes her, before handing her on to his subordinates. A month later she is murdered, her body thrown into the Seine. Although an extreme case, it suggests that it could often be sensible for a woman to take stock of her situation and consider the outcome of her reaction to sexual or romantic advances.

However, it must also be remembered that, beyond merely being a form of accommodation, 'horizontal' collaboration occurred because those involved had genuine emotional motivations, though stories of 'true romance' do not fit with the largely cynical and satirical portrayals of France and the French offered by the four authors. Mlle Vrin, the spinsterish and somewhat lonely churchgoer in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, previously developed an attraction for a German soldier billeted with her. Although her obsession would seem to be partly due to her loneliness, it is keenly felt, and reminds the reader of the deep personal feelings that could be experienced. Moreover, it also highlights a key point made by all the novels: namely that each instance of collaboration in daily life is distinct, and should be evaluated on its own merits, rather than become lost in large-scale purges.

Commitment

Whilst the previous two sections detail collaboration undertaken through either a calculated analysis of the wartime situation, or to simply aid necessary coexistence, there remain those individuals and groups who willingly collaborated through

commitment to Nazi Germany itself, and its ideals, or through a belief that working with and for the Germans offered France new opportunities as a nation, which would break the chain of disasters which had befallen the country.

One of the most pervasive forces in French society was the Roman Catholic Church, which at its higher levels was closely involved with Vichy. [408] However, this was by no means a uniform stance, and it would be incorrect to accuse the Church, *en bloc*, of collaboration.[409] It would appear the Church was as affected by the changing fortunes of war as the rest of the population.[410] However, as the selected novels make clear, Church collaboration and acquiescence in the Occupation were noted.

The widest coverage given to any aspect of the Church is in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, which examines the relationship between the local priest, Abbé Varèmes, and the village. The Abbé is, from his introduction in the novel, identified as someone who agrees with order (and, by implication, Vichy). He feels sympathy for the persecuted economic collaborator Lécheur, who provides him with cakes. In this, the Abbé links himself with the German commandant, to whom Lécheur also supplies cakes, as they are 'les deux valeurs du pays'.[411] However, the Abbé also feels superior and more drawn to order than the local commandant. The Abbé relates that, on the morning British and American flags were found flying from the highest tree in the market place, it was he who induced the local commandant to make a report to the area *Kommandantur*. The Abbé also advocates the

[408] For details of the church involvement see W.D Hall, *Politics, Society and Christianity in Vichy France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), and Jacques-Olivier Boudon, *Les Catholiques dans la guerre 1939-1945: Entre Vichy et la Résistance* (Paris: Hachette, 1998).
[409] For details of Church resistance, see Limore Yagil, *Chrétiens et juifs sous Vichy (1940–1944): Sauvetage et désobéissance civile* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
[410] Vinen, *The Unfree French*, pp. 257-8.
[411] Bory, *MV*, p. 68.

imprisonment of those responsible for persecuting Lécheur, and his belief in his version of order can be seen as a manifestation of the struggle for power and mastery present within village life.[412]

In his belief in order, the Abbé can be seen as representing elements of the wider Church and its view on its role in French society during the Occupation. The Church was a bastion of social order which Pétain embraced, and he in turn was welcomed by the Church as a providential leader.[413] However, the Abbé's rigid adherence to order ultimately leads to his downfall. In a Sunday sermon, he verbally attacks the village, condemning a secret dance they have held. This he condemns as 'corrupt and seditious'. He then links these to the attacks on Lécheur: 'les mêmes éléments pourris attaquent un honnête citoyen de Jumainville! Un bon chrétien, et défèrent envers nos hôtes [the Germans]'.[414] Afterwards, complaints are made to the Bishop and he is removed. This is not, however, treated by the author as a chance to show the Church hierarchy is not collaborationist. Instead, the narrative presentation of this section illustrates that the condemnation of the dance is the main grievance of the local population, which in turn can be seen as a statement on the townsfolk's prioritising of their own interests (in this case their social life), with the Abbé's hectoring style at odds with his congregation. This also comments on the *Révolution nationale*, which, by the period presented within the novel, had become a source of ridicule to the French, who were apathetic and lethargic to its aims in light of the on-going privations they were suffering.[415]

---

[412] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance*, p. 191.
[413] Étienne Fouilloux, 'Le Clergé', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992), p. 468.
[414] Bory, *MV,* p. 227.
[415] Flonneau 'L'évolution de l'opinion publique', pp. 517-518.

The Abbé also reveals his views on the Occupation. Those who harass Lécheur should be condemned, the Abbé believes: 'les âmes saines n'hésitent pas à les denoncer aux maîtres que le ciel nous a donnés pour notre pénitence'.[416] The Occupation is God's judgement on France, which ties into themes of punishment and sacrifice, which were an important part of Pétain's discourse.[417] However, not all churchmen were as publicly committed to the cause. At the town fayre in aid of prisoners of war in *Les Forêts de la nuit,* a generous donation is made. When the benefactor comments that nothing is too much for a cause under the aegis of the Marshal, M. le doyen merely coughs in response, as he wishes to remain prudent. This silence is later given voice by a question from the pro-resistance M. de Balansun, who enquires whether the fayre has taken place 'sous la protection de Dieu ou celle de César?', Caesar implying Pétain. With a faint smile, the Doyen gives his response: 'Cher comte, chuchota-t-il à l'oreille de M. de Balansun, l'Eglise est une mère prudente. Quand il s'agit du salut de ses enfants malheureux, elle sait composer avec les puissances séculières, tout en priant secrètement le Ciel pour que leur règne soit éphémère'.[418]

Whilst this statement pleases the somewhat foolish Balansun, in reality it is a politic and equivocal answer, with the author's choice of language providing a somewhat patronising edge, reinforcing Balansun's perceived naïveté. The examples provided by *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* and *Les Forêts de la nuit* show the churchmen as either guilty of collaboration, or at the very least *attentisme*. Whilst the Abbé's pomposity and rigid attachment to Vichy contrasts with the Doyen's worldly

[416] Bory, *MV*, p. 227
[417] Richard Francis Crane, 'La Croix and the Swastika: The Ambiguities of Catholic Responses to the Fall of France', *Catholic Historical Review* 90 (2004), p. 46.
[418] Curtis, *FdlN*, pp. 305-306.

politicking, neither is represented as engaging with the laity in an upright and moral fashion. From these presentations, the cynical and self-interested elements within the church would have been recognisable, and whether as individuals or types, the representations can be seen as 'essentialist and grounded in nature'.[419]

Whilst novels are ready to condemn the Church, moral judgement remains an important feature. As discussed, 'horizontal' collaboration was the focus of highly-visible punishment at the Liberation. Yet, during the Occupation, condemnation was also forthcoming from French collaborators, who saw the need to cleanse France of such behaviour if France were to match up to the standards expected of the *Révolution nationale*.[420] In *Le Chemin des écoliers*, Malinier, who joins the LVF, comes across a group of German soldiers talking with a group of girls assumed to be prostitutes. Malinier disapproves of the girls talking in German, and of their activities with the Germans in general:

> Bien qu'il ne les eût jamais fréquentées depuis qu'il avait, en 1928, quitté l'uniforme, les filles étaient pour lui un bien national, une catégorie de créatures prises dans le ciment humain de la communauté française et qu'il se refusait à considérer comme un simple matériel. Un soir de l'été précédent, passant place Clichy, il avait exhorté des professionnelles qui racolaient des Allemands, leur remontrant que ce n'était pas bien de coucher avec l'ennemi et qu'il ne manquait pas de bons Français à qui s'adresser'.[421]

This illustrates that sexual involvement was not just viewed as a bodily act, but also one which symbolised the situation France found herself in. Willingly giving oneself to the conqueror without regard was not approved of, due to its symbolic nature, and the choice of the phrase 'bien national' is suggestive of the link made

[419] Atack, *Literature and the French Resistance*, p. 187.
[420] Luc Capdevila, *Les Bretons au lendemain de l'occupation* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 1999), pp. 204-218.
[421] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 111.

between women and the nation, which saw women's sexual relations with Germans as a metaphor of France's own prostration to the conqueror.[422] In response to this, head-shavings represented revenge against the symbolic 'impotence' Frenchmen suffered at the hands of their native women and German occupiers.[423]

This would explain the low opinion of such women by their contemporaries represented in the novels discussed and wider historical record.[424] Denise is the brazen lover of a German soldier in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, and parades her affection by wearing a necklace with a swastika on it. This, naturally, is widely disapproved of. However, this visible support for Nazism is not based on any rational thought process. As is remarked by another character, 'ça serait les Américains, qu'elle ferait pareil'.[425] This point is re-enforced by Denise herself, who, whilst considering her hair colour, remarks to herself 'on verra à changer la couleur si les Américains n'aiment pas ce blond-là'.[426] Such statements are typical of Denise's shallow, unintelligent character, content to enjoy the pleasures of the moment without consideration of wider consequences.

However, although Denise's pro-Nazi display is not the subject of any deep reflection on her behalf, her life nevertheless comes to an unpleasant conclusion. Hiding in a barn set on fire to hide evidence of black market activities, she is burnt to death trapped under a bale whilst waiting for her lover. Bory describes her final seconds tersely, but effectively. Although portrayed as somewhat selfish and vain, the reader cannot consider this a reasonable end, and her death is an analogy for

[422] Joan Tumblety, "The Real and the Imaginary: Political Discourse and Gender in France during the Occupation, 1940-1944," *European Legacy* 1 (1996), pp. 31-35.
[423] Alain Brossat, *Les tondues: un carnaval moche*, (Levallois-Perret: Manya, 1992), p. 111.
[424] Gildea, *Marianne in Chains*, p. 75.
[425] Bory, *MV*, p. 89.
[426] Bory, *MV*, p. 257.

some of those who suffered at the Liberation. Denise's desire to be with her lover leads to a horrifying end and makes her character the focus of this scene, whilst those involved in the black market succeed in hiding evidence of their activities and are less focused on in the narrative: whilst Denise suffers a terrible fate which far outweighs the seriousness of her activities, those involved in far more criminal acts escape real justice. Compared with this, head-shaving, despite its indignity, would likely have been preferable.

Unlike Denise, however, many involved with, or supportive of collaboration in daily life did so with deeper conviction. Malinier, in *Le Chemin des Ecoliers*, has pre-existing views of the Left as the 'enemy within', and this is a theme the novel goes on to develop through his character. Upon his introduction in the novel, he states that France is dismembered and mutilated, reduced to a few provinces by those whom Malinier would wish to remove: Jews, Communists, Free-Masons, cubist painters, financiers and poets, whom he sums up colloquially as 'toute la youpinerie et ses écuries'.[427] Such views, and this list of 'enemies' is highly representative of the views of the nationalist Right, and in particular *Action Française* and Charles Maurras, who saw them as examples of the weakness and decadence of the Third Republic (although it should be noted Maurras did not target cubist painters and poets).[428]

Their connivance in the Popular Front has brought France to defeat, and in that defeat they are the ones that are seen to benefit, Malinier describing graphically how: 'Réfugiée sur cet espace étroit, une juiverie polyglotte et pullulante dévorait

[427] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 103.
[428] H. R. Kedward, 'Patriots and Patriotism in Vichy France' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, 32 (1982), p. 175.

la sève de la France et la moelle des Français; les communistes égorgeaient les notaires et les derniers patriotes tandis que les francs-maçons se partageaient les deniers de l'Etat et que les peintres cubistes installaient leurs chevalets sur la place de l'Opéra'.[429] This absurd litany, which can be seen as a parody of anti-Semitic discourse, is one easy to examine, for Malinier is a man constantly preoccupied with the situation that has overtaken France. It would seem that, through this character, Aymé is representing the politically-motivated individual as obsessed with France's fate, as Malinier is seen by Yvette: 'La plupart du temps, il parlait seul, avec une violence désolée, et ses yeux fiévreux, sa voix rauque faisaient penser au délire d'un moine visionnaire. Les malheurs de la France lui étaient toujours présents'.[430]

Thus, it is easy to gauge his views and appreciate his support for the Marshal, which encompasses many of the pre-war and wartime motivations that lead to support for Pétain. Yet, the author's use of 'délire' is interesting, for with its psychological connotations it indicates Malinier is not of sound mind, this madness explaining his feverish belief in the Marshal, as well as providing an excuse for his beliefs.

Anti-Semitism is a position commonly commented upon in the novels, as Malinier illustrates most forcefully, even if the Holocaust itself is overlooked. In the second paragraph of *Au Bon Beurre*, Charles-Hubert suggests all Jews should have been sent to the front at the beginning of hostilities. Within *Les Forêts de la nuit*, Mme

[429] Aymé, *CdE*, p 102.
[430] *Ibid*., p. 97.

Costellot suggests that Jews are responsible for the moral degradation of the Anglo-Saxon world, her choice of theme and expression mirroring the anti-Semitic propaganda of the period, which once again blames the defeat of France in 1940 on the Jews - a common feature in German newsreel propaganda at the time.[431] However, whilst sections of the population could be said to be anti-Semitic, with expressions of this ilk common, there was some change after 1942, for whatever the population's views on the whole, it would appear the majority were opposed to the deportations.[432] The novelists do not comment directly on the deportations, with their characters choosing to overlook or ignore such problematic issues. Mme Costellot is, however, representative of a particular pro-German individual, for alongside her anti-Semitism she is also an Anglophobe, with a deep dislike for the English, a vague feeling before the war which grew rapidly after June 1940.

Despite these active political opinions, it should be realised that many went along with collaboration because they were uninterested in the wider wartime situation. In spite of its representation of a broad cross-section of wartime Parisian society, *Le Chemin des écoliers*, in particular, emphasises this attitude. Michaud is told by his associate Lolivier to be concerned only with his own small worries. Whilst these worries (the black-out, lack of taxis, and a lack of coal) are related to the war, Michaud had similar small worries before the war, an analysis that Michaud has to agree with, remarking 'je ne sais que retomber dans les plis de ma petite sensibilité'.[433] Lolivier later admits to a similar condition. Whilst the war is a catastrophe, he still lives on the same street, with the same unfortunate wife and

[431] Brett Bowles, 'German newsreel propaganda in France, 1940–1944', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 24 (2004), p. 175.
[432] Sweets, *Choices in Vichy France*, pp. 131-132.
[433] Aymé, *CdE*, p. 87.

sadistic son, which he regards as 'real' life, compared with events such as Churchill's speeches and the war in Russia, which seem to him almost unreal.

Conclusion

What, then, do these novels tell us of collaboration in daily life? They provide descriptions of a broad spectrum of collaboration, painting a grim (if sometimes darkly humorous) picture of the war years, which present the period in a realistic manner. Nicholas Hewitt has described Marcel Aymé as a 'formidable chronicler who carefully rectifies the conventional historical myths propagated by the victors', a view which could be applied to all the novelists discussed in this chapter.[434] Although economic collaboration does not take account of those in 'big business' at the outset of the war, they do consider how people like the Poissonards and Boudet are willing to profit from the situation. Although Boudet does not maintain his wealth, the Poissonards have a highly successful war, and benefit from factors that are common to all novels: petty greed and great selfishness, displayed towards countrymen and Occupiers alike. These factors are also present in social interaction with the occupying forces, and such interaction is shown to be a regular occurrence. Denunciation is presented as a valuable social tool, although not all interaction is as calculated. Some interact with the Germans purely for simple benefits and a good time, which explains much of the romantic involvement in the novels, as Mme Arréguy's affairs with a German soldier illustrates. She cares little for him, romantically, but enjoys his company.

[434] Nicholas Hewitt, ''Marcel Aymé and the Dark Night of the Occupation', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989), p. 226.

Political opinion also shows and explains support for collaboration, and represents anti-Semitism in French society candidly. Pétain's appeal is a clear feature of collaborators in the novels, even if the novelists show it diminishing over time and being by no means universal. Overall, it can be considered that, due to their nuanced representations, the novels are not judgemental. Although irony is often levelled at collaborating characters, it is a tool directed at the resistance in equal measure. This is a comment on the authors' subversion of the moral judgement of supposed collaborators, and highlights the reality of the difference between what is expressed and believed privately by individuals, and what is expressed openly by those in the public eye.[435] When compared with historical material on the period, such as Alary's *Les Français au quotidien*, the novels present a largely balanced view of the time they cover, and although some issues, such as French involvement in the Holocaust and the role of the *malgré-nous* are not discussed, they present a balanced view of a society involved with and aware of wide-scale collaboration, which is at odds with the political narrative Rousso presents. Crucially, Rousso's schema fails to fully address collaboration in daily life: his attention to the 'offficial' story neglects important cultural literary material which gives a richly documented account of people's everyday behaviour which subverts his thesis about the repression of discreditable memories.

[435] Robert Gildea, 'The Resistance Myth, the Pétainist Myth and Other Voices', in Debra Kelly (ed.), *Remembering and Representing the Experience of War in Twentieth-Century France: Committing to Memory* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), p. 38.

Chapter Four: Representations of Intellectual and Cultural Collaboration

The majority of the period 1954 to 1971 was dominated by the Gaullist 5th Republic, and was one in which, according to *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, the political élite sought to silence any reminder of wartime divisions, with the widespread amnesties of 1951-53 for former collaborators seeking to mark a clean break with the past and herald a new beginning for the nation.[436] The period embodied the boom years of *les trente glorieuses*, and, more specifically, of *la République gaullienne*,[437] and was a period of increasing affluence in which more and more French men and women enjoyed the fruits of post-war prosperity. According to Rousso, this allowed for the creation of a myth about occupied France which was meant to play down the role of collaborators, dominated by the political ascendency de Gaulle. This has been labelled the `Gaullist myth', which can be summarised in a number of central tenets or beliefs. Firstly, during the war years, there had been minimal collaboration, with only a handful of fanatics and marginal individuals, atypical of French opinion, involved in collaboration. Concomitant to this was the notion of national unity: the French population was essentially unified, and also in essence patriotic. Secondly, France's interests were protected by an élite of heroic Resistance fighters, who were in turn supported by the mass of the patriotic French public. Finally, de Gaulle was the personification of this heroic Resistance: `Le premier Résistant de France'.

---

[436] Betram M. Gordon, 'The "Vichy Syndrome" Problem in History', *French Historical Studies* 19 (1995), p. 497.

[437] For further information, see Jean Fourastié, *Les Trente Glorieuses ou la révolution invisible de 1946 à 1975* (Paris: Hachette, 2004).

Rousso used the terms 'la France résistante' or 'le résistancialisme' to describe this myth. Historians and critics had proposed a number of explanations for the 'Gaullist Myth', focusing primarily on the need to boost morale, a need to establish order and stability, a desire to re-enforce de Gaulle's political legitimacy, and to assert France's claim to greatness.[438] The 'Gaullist myth' tended, as a result, to minimize the active role of Vichy and the support it commanded amongst the French population as a whole, instead creating a new object of memory, the Resistance, which reconciled different groups (for example the Gaullists and Communists). Rousso identifies three primary reasons for this change. Firstly, France was entering a period of economic growth which allowed memories of wartime privation to fade. Whilst these memories retained a direct link to the shortages and black marketeering of the Occupation, they allowed this aspect of the war to remain fresh (it should be noted that this setting added immediacy to novels, such as Dutourd's *Au Bon Buerre*, which focused on the economic life of the Occupation). However, as this link faded with economic growth, so too did the ability to compare everyday life with the war years. Secondly, other hatreds and conflicts took the place of those of the war. The defeat of France in May 1954 at Dien Bien Phu, and the first stirrings of the war in Algeria provided new challenges which displaced those of the war and the immediate post-war reconstruction. Finally, 1954 witnessed the apex of the career of Pierre Mendès France who, whilst a leading resistance figure, led a generation who had little interest in refighting old battles and who were instead focused on facing the future.[439]

[438] See, for example, Jean Touchard, *Le Gaullisme 1940-1969* (Paris: Seuil, 1978), p.353 and Pierre Laborie, *Le chagrin et le venim: La France sous l'Occupation, mémoire et idées recues* (Paris: Bayard, 2011), p.58.
[439] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 77 - 78.

Indeed, whilst these factors moved public attention away from the war, so too - according to Rousso - did the facets of remaining controversies about the war years that continued to be played out illustrate the gradual diminishment of such concerns from public life. Some cases point to a simple decrease in interest. For example, the Oberg-Knochen trial, which judged Karl Oberg, head of the SS in France from 1942-1944, and his adjutant, Helmet Knochen, was a relatively muted affair compared with the trial of French officials a few years before, even though the SS in France had worked with the French police (and indeed, the trial involved the testimony of René Bousquet, Vichy's chief of police).[440]

This diminishment was also due to the fact that, despite the purge, a clear definition of collaboration had not been provided, which allowed collaboration to be downplayed as a factor of importance in all but the most controversial of cases - and even with this lack of clear definition allowed unfortunate aspects to be glossed over. As Rousso points out, this can most clearly be seen within the case of the Académie Française and André François-Poncet's election to Pétain's now-vacant chair, which required François-Poncet to give a eulogy of his predecessor.[441] Similar difficulties arose in 1956, when Jérôme Carcopino, the former Vichy education minister, was admitted to the Académie.[442] Carcopino's wartime past was not addressed, and François-Poncet's speech of welcome instead focused on his subject's ability as an historian of ancient Rome.

The case of Paul Morand was perhaps the most illuminating of the period under consideration within this chapter. Morand caused controversy when, in 1958, he

[440] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 78 - 79.
[441] See chapter two.
[442] For further information of Carcopino's wartime activity, see Stéphanie Corcy-Debray, *Jérôme Carcopino, un historien à Vichy* (Paris: Harmattan, 2001).

sought and failed to gain election to the Académie. The debate over his candidature was prompted by his career as a diplomat and writer. Morand had been a vocal anti-Semite and served as Vichy's ambassador to Romania in 1943 and to Switzerland in 1944, as well as writing for collaborationist newspapers such as *Combats*. Yet despite his collaboration, Morand had never actually been found guilty of breaking any laws during the post-war purge. Furthermore, the end of the war does not seem to have altered his attitude to the Occupation. His 1951 novel *Le Flagellant de Séville*, a tale of the Napoleonic Occupation of Spain, justifing collaboration and denying resistance, can be seen as an allegory of wartime France.[443] Within the novel, a defence of collaboration with the occupier is also supplied, and Morand, by comparing the France of 1940 with the occupied Spain of 1808-14, points to the trans-historical nature of collaborationist behaviour.[444] For Morand, as collaboration is trans-historical, and has a logic that can be repeated in different historical locations and locales, the collaboration of wartime France should not be seen as unusual or atypical, but instead as an understandable phenomenon.

Ultimately, Morand failed to gain election in 1958, not primarily because of his collaboration (although this was a vitally important issue), but because of the internal politics and wrangling between the Left and the Right within the Académie.[445] He was to attempt to join again in 1959, but in the interim de Gaulle had come to power, and sensationally vetoed Morand's attempt.[446] For Rousso, the low-key Oberg-Knochen trial, together with the attitudes displayed by the

[443] Ginette Guitard-Auviste, *Paul Morand (1888-1976): Légende et vérités* (Paris: Balland, 1994), p. 247.
[444] Kimberly Philpot van Noort, *Paul Morand: The Politics and Practice of Writing in Post-War France* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2001), p. 35.
[445] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy,* pp. 84-85.
[446] For further information, see Noort, *Paul Morand*, p.161. Morand finally gained entry to the Académie in 1968. His election and its context are discussed within the next chapter.

Académie, indicated a repression of memories of collaboration. Even this case illustrates how the past was downplayed, for his candidacy had many defenders and foundered on the politics of the situation; it can be seen that his 1959 attempt was vetoed not because of his past activity in itself, but because of the contemporary storm in public life it was causing. Additionally, and ultimately, the example of Morand should be seen, according to Rousso, as an exception which highlights widespread repression of memories of collaboration.[447] This perceived fading of memories of collaboration during the Occupation continued until 1964, when the wartime past was given a new sheen by de Gaulle, who bestowed on France 'l'honneur inventé', which focused on resistance and the country's 'grandeur', and which is the subject of the next chapter.[448]

Rousso presents a convincing case for the repression of memories of collaboration within public life from 1954 and into the 1960s, alongside the amnesties that took place, and provides much evidence for this by examining France's intellectual and cultural élite within the Académie Française. Alongside this repression, Rousso shows that de Gaulle focused his attention on a memory of the Resistance and showed that 'l'histoire de France, entre 1940 et 1944, s'est écrite à Londres et à Alger. Avant la cristallisation définitive du mythe résistancialiste des années 1960, dernière étape, il va tenter une fois de plus l'exorcisme de l'an quarante'.[449] Yet was this myth of the Resistance accepted by the French people? Rousso's view is clear, but did de Gaulle's viewpoint dominate as completely as has been suggested? As 1954 has been identified as a turning point in the way that the war years were

[447] An example of such repression is the career of François Mitterrand, whose wartime past only came a major public controversy in 1994, with the publication of Pierre Péan's biography of the President's youth. See Pierre Péan, *Une jeunesse française: François Mitterrand, 1934-1947* (Paris: Fayard, 2011).
[448] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp.100-101.
[449] *Ibid*., p. 89.

remembered in France, and as intellectual and cultural collaboration has been identified as an important area in which this repression took place, this chapter will examine novels which provide representations of those involved in intellectual and cultural collaboration during the war years to answer these questions.

Before this examination is made, a brief discussion and definition of intellectual and cultural collaboration must be provided. Firstly, however, it should be acknowledged for the purposes of this chapter that whilst intellectual activities either were cultural, or reflective of cultural activity, much of this activity was by no means intellectual. Secondly, these forms of collaboration, like the political, can be divided into two particular types: the openly collaborationist environment of Paris, which fell under direct German influence from 1940 onwards, and the return to traditional values espoused by Pétain's Vichy-based regime, and which dominated the intellectual and cultural forces which his government supported and engaged with. With such competing factions, it is unsurprising that Vichy failed to produce a coherent cultural policy.[450] Yet whilst both these forms of intellectual and cultural activity were distinct, their ethos shared strong aspects of counterculture, which aimed to criticize, suppress and remove aspects from French public life which they felt typified the decadence of the Third Republic.

Céline: The Author and His Background

The 'trilogie allemande' of Louis Ferdinand Céline (the pen name of French writer and doctor Louis-Ferdinand Destouches), provides a useful window through which

[450] Elizabeth Campbell Karlsgodt, *Defending National Treasures: French Art and heritage under Vichy* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), p. 41.

a literary representation of intellectual and cultural collaboration can be viewed. A portion of this trilogy, Celine's *D'un Château l'autre*, published in 1957, is the primary subject of this chapter. Céline, considered one of the most influential and innovative writers of the twentieth century, developed a new style of writing that modernized French literature.[451] He remains, however, a controversial figure because of his anti-Semitism and racism, which remained strong aspects of his work before, during, and after the Second World War.[452]

At the outbreak of war in 1939, Céline left the centre of Paris for suburban Saint-Germain-en-Laye, where he opened a medical practice. By October, however, it was clear that this venture had failed, and he returned to the capital. In search of work, he obtained a position as a ship's doctor, which allowed him both the rank of sub-lieutenant and to feel he was contributing to the war effort. Céline enjoyed this new position, but it was not to last: in January 1940, his ship was involved in an accident, and although Céline was commended for his work tending the injured, the subsequent scrapping of his ship meant he was again without employment. Following this he once again returned to Paris, where he took over the running of a clinic, and it was in this capacity that he experienced the Exodus. As part of the Exodus he nearly escaped to Britain, but ultimately found himself working as a doctor in a refugee camp before returning to Paris after the Armistice. Following this, Céline was in the unusual position of being on the side of those now in power, and secured for himself the position of head of the Bezons clinics.[453]

---

[451] Jean-Pierre Dauphin (ed), *Les critiques de notre temps et Céline* (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1976), p.7.
[452] Henri Godard, *Céline scandale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), pp.100-109.
[453] Nicholas Hewitt, *The Life of Céline: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 188-193.

Céline found the Occupation gave him a position of some influence, and due to his pre-war writings he moved easily in Paris collaborationist circles. Such were his views that he was considered as an outside contender for the position of Vichy Commissaire Général aux Questions Juives. However, Céline was destined never to attain any official position in collaborating groups, although his anti-Communism and anti-Semitism ensured he was often on the fringes of such organisations. His support of the creation of the LVF, building on the reputation he previously had for fascist views, was already evident in the pre-war *L'Ecole des cadavres*, in which he calls for a Franco-German entente in order to counter the alliance between British intelligence and 'la juiverie mondiale'.[454] Such support meant the Germans were willing to work with him if possible, and saw him as moderately important. To be seen as 'moderately important', however, points to Céline's care in maintaining a somewhat ambivalent position. Whilst his clearest support for collaboration was in literary expression, he was at pains to point out that any of his writings published by the collaborationist press were 'private' correspondence, which he had sent to the journals for free. He was careful to maintain he was not in a position where he was officially linked to them. This is also apparent in his views after Stalingrad. The probability of ultimate defeat for the Germans soon became apparent to him, and he was careful thereafter to moderate his views somewhat.[455] However, despite such moderation, Céline was aware of the position his views and the circles in which he had moved had placed him, and he fled France prior to the Liberation, ultimately joining the last remnants of the Vichy government in Sigmaringen. He subsequently lived in exile for a number of years in Denmark.

---

[454] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *L'Ecole des cadavres* (Paris: Denoël, 1938).
[455] Hewitt, *The Life of Céline*, pp. 207-216.

During the rise of Nazi Germany and under the Occupation, Céline had written three typically cynical and anti-Semitic pamphlets: *Bagatelles pour un massacre* in 1937, *L'École des cadavres* in 1938 and *Les Beaux draps* in 1941, which can be seen as typical of the intellectual collaborator's desire to carry out the *déjudaisation* of French culture.[456] The massacre Céline had in mind when he titled his first overtly anti-Semitic pamphlet *Bagatelles pour un massacre* was that of the "goïms," or Gentiles, who he thought would lead France to slaughter in another great war, the first of which he had experienced and been injured in. In later years he was to claim that he had undergone trepanation at the hands of army surgeons when his arm was injured in 1915. This claim was false, invented for reasons that grew out of Céline's desire to depict himself as an unjustly persecuted loner, a theme that exists in much of his work, and which can be seen clearly within his 'trilogie allemande'.

Céline was a friend of the German sculptor Arno Breker. He visited Breker for the last time in Germany in 1943 at Breker's Castle Jaeckelsbruch, near Berlin. After the Vichy regime fell in 1944, by fleeing to Sigmaringen, Céline was in the company of the Pétain, and Laval. For a brief time, Céline acted as Laval's personal physician. It is this episode that provided the inspiration for his fictional account in *D'un Château l'autre*. After the fall of the Nazi government, Céline subsequently fled to Denmark. He was branded a collaborator, convicted in absentia in 1950, in France, to one year of imprisonment, and declared a national disgrace. He was subsequently granted amnesty and returned to France in 1951. These episodes, at the close of the war, provided the motivation for a fictional account of Céline's life in this period, the first of which is *D'un Château l'autre*. After his return to France

[456] Judaken, 'Intellectuals, Culture, and the Vichy Years', p. 90.

he settled in Meudon, where he was visited by several friends and artists, among them the famous actress Arletty.[457] Arletty herself was suspected of collaboration, and had continued to work during the Occupation as well as enjoying affairs with occupying German officers, which led to her internment and a period of prohibition from acting at the Liberation.[458]

Céline's fiction is pervaded by pessimism as his characters experience failure, anxiety, nihilism, and inertia. The narrative of betrayal and exploitation, both real and imagined, corresponds with his personal life, although his two real loves, his wife and his cat Bébert, are mentioned with nothing other than a kindness and warmth which stand in marked contrast to the content of the rest of his work. A progressive disintegration of personality appears in the stylistic incoherence of his books based on his life during the war. However, some critics claim that the books are less incoherent than intentionally fragmented, and that they represent the final development of the style introduced with *Voyage au bout de la nuit* in 1932, which would agree with the reading of *D'un Château l'autre* in this chapter, suggesting that Céline maintained his faculties in clear working order to the end of his days.

Céline's writings, such as *Guignol's band* (1944) and its companion novel *Le Pont de Londres* (1964),[459] can be seen as examples of black comedy, in which ill-fated and frequently appalling things are described entertainingly, yet remain serious topics.[460] Céline's writing is often hyper-real, and its polemic qualities can often be startling; however, his main strength lies in his ability to discredit almost

[457] Antony Beevor and Artemis Cooper, *Paris after the Liberation, 1944-1949* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1994), p. 466-467.
[458] Frederick Spotts, *The Shameful Peace – How French Artists and Intellectuals Survived the Nazi Occupation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 241.
[459] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *Guignol's band, tomes 1 et 2* (Paris: Gallimard, 1989).
[460] Hamel, *La Bataille des memoires*, p. 140.

everything and yet not lose a sense of enraged humanity. As the years go by, attitudes may change regarding Céline's role in the French political scene, beginning in 1937. Nonetheless, the existence of his pamphlets will probably forever be a stumbling block to admirers of his novels. If he had not written them, it could be claimed (at least by his supporters), he might today be ranked as one of the greatest modern French novelists.

Céline's reputation as a writer has been overshadowed by his anti-Semitism and anti-Communism, although his importance as an innovative author has been recognized, and he is seen as an author who not only created his own language, but also his own world view, through 'le système célinien'.[461] All of Céline's books are more or less based on his own life, and can be defined as a 'pacte autobiographique'.[462] This is emphasized in his use of first-person narrative and the use of names with which he identifies - Ferdinand: Ferdine: Dr. Destouches: Céline. In post-war works, the narrator is a Louis-Ferdinand Céline / Dr. Louis Destouches (except in *Conversations with Professor Y*, which is a series of imaginary interviews), and this is the case in the trilogy beginning with *D'un Château l'autre*.

***D'un Château l'autre*: The Author, His Novel and Other Collaborators**

Work began on *D'un Château l'autre* in mid-1954, and the novel was published three years later on 20 June 1957. This completion of the manuscript for *D'un Château l'autre* was immediately followed by work on the second novel in the

[461] J. M. G. Le Clézio, *On ne peut pas ne pas lire Céline* in *Les critiques de notre temps et Céline* (Paris: Éditions Garnier Frères, 1976), p. 184.
[462] Thomas Spear, 'De l'Autofiction', in Peter Dunwoodie (ed.), *Actes du colloque international de Londres* (Paris: Lérot & Société études Céliniennes, 1989), p. 237.

trilogy, *Nord.* This was published in May 1959, when writing of the ultimate work of the trilogy, *Rigodon,* had already started. This was to be completed in draft on 30 June 1961, the day before Céline's death.[463] The publication of *D'un Château l'autre* marked the author's return to the cultural mainstream and the rebirth of wide public interest in his work.[464] Yet, perhaps in light of Rousso's argument of memory repression in the period dealt with in this chapter, it can be argued, as it is by Nicholas Hewitt, that the novel owed much of its success to the perception that it gave an eyewitness account of the final days of the Vichy government in exile.[465] Moreover, and importantly for this chapter, it also provides the reader with access to the mentality of a character whose intellectual life has meant his alignment (to a greater or lesser extent) with the Vichy regime. Despite the fact that it is impossible to make claims of historical veracity for large parts of *D'un Château l'autre*, it nevertheless provides a (fictional) presentation of an important and controversial part of France's recent past. Céline himself made this point in a 1957 radio interview; the novel was a representation of something readily recognisable to the wider public:

> Je suis l'objet d'une sorte d'interdit depuis un certain nombre d'années, et, en faisant paraître un ouvrage qui est malgré tout assez public, puisqu'il parle de faits bien connus, et qui intéressent tout de même les Français, - puisque c'est une petite partie, toute petite mais enfin quand même, une petite partie de l'histoire de France : je parle de Pétain, je parle de Laval, je parle de Sigmaringen, c'est un moment de l'histoire de France, qu'on le veuille ou non ; il peut être regrettable, on peut le regretter, mais c'est tout de même un moment de l'histoire de France, ça a existé et un jour on en parlera dans les écoles...[466]

---

[463] Hewitt, *The Life of Céline*, pp. 273-74.
[464] Colin Nettelbeck, 'Céline' in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation*, (Oxford: Berg, 1989), p. 191.
[465] Hewitt, *The Life of Céline*, p. 276.
[466] Jean-Pierre Dauphin and Henri Godard (eds.), *Cahiers Céline 2, Céline et l'actualité littéraire, 1957-1961*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), p. 68.

This statement can be interpreted in different ways, with the author perhaps attempting to make his work palatable to the public whilst not overly diluting its importance. Thus, Céline is keen to emphasize that although the events he relates are a small, indeed very small, part of the history of France, they are nonetheless a part of the France's history which can be seen as absolving the majority of the people of France (Céline's potential readership) of involvement in the regrettable events described. Yet simultaneously, whilst avoiding offending his readership's sensibilities, he is keen to point out the significance of his novel as a description of a period which is undeniably a part of French history. However, whilst Céline is sensitive to his potential audience, on one issue he is not: the work 'parle de faits bien connus, et qui intéressent tout de même les Français'.[467] This statement, and the success of the novel, would suggest that neither Céline nor his audience believed in a memory of the war which attempted to repress recollection of collaboration, and that memory of, and interest in, collaboration remained widespread. Indeed, it is quite possible to describe Céline's work as 'antirésistancialiste', with collaboration being treated as the norm.[468]

Céline would also have been keen to describe the events he described as 'regrettable' because of his own involvement. The effects this stigma could have on sales of *D'un Château l'autre* meant he had to be careful in its promotion, which, despite its subject matter, was nevertheless commercially marketable and returned the author to the mainstream.[469] This poses the question: was Céline himself a collaborator? It is worth pointing out that whatever the truth of the charges that against him, he was widely seen as a collaborator. Moreover, he was seen as one of

[467] Dauphin and Godard (eds.), *Cahiers Céline 2,* p. 68.
[468] Hamel, *La Bataille des memoires*, p. 33.
[469] Hewitt, *The Life of Céline,* p. 274.

the most excessive and well-known collaborators by the French public (suffering, as others in the cultural sphere, from being more visible under the Occupation than other collaborators, such as business leaders).[470] This in turn makes him highly comparable to other well-known cultural figures, such as Sacha Guitry, the eminent actor and playwright (although it should be noted Guitry was not an anti-Semite). Céline was certainly infamous for his reputed collaboration, and this was a reputation which was to remain with him, sustained considerably, one would suspect, by the publication of the *D'un Château l'autre* trilogy.

Yet, whilst Céline, through his novels, openly linked himself to collaboration, Guitry was far more typical of those involved in intellectual and cultural collaboration, and provides one of the most well-known cases of an artist's denial of responsibility for collaboration. During the war, he cultivated German officials almost as soon as the armistice had been signed, and was part of a high-profile group of social collaborators from the theatre world that included Cocteau, Arletty and Alice Cocéa. His views were made clear in his literary-artistic 1942 tribute to Pétain, *De Jeanne d'Arc à Philippe Pétain, 1492 à 1942*, a revisionist work which saw the advent of Pétain - the 'saviour of France' - as the culmination of modern French history. At the Liberation, due to such activities, and his social contact (and attendant benefits) with the occupier, Guitry was exceedingly unpopular and clearly linked to collaboration.[471] Yet unlike Céline's written work which examined the war years, Guitry's response, his 1947 memoir *Quatre ans d'occupations* was an endless selection of self-serving denials, whose multiplicity can be seen to

[470] Hewitt, *The Life of Céline*, p. 233. For the 'visibility' of different forms of collaboration, see chapter one.
[471] Spotts, *The Shameful Peace*, p. 237-239.

undermine Guitry's own case,[472] and which give the memoir a highly fictive element.

However, despite the different periods in which they wrote, similarities can be observed between Céline and Guitry. Firstly, they highlight the high-profile nature of those involved with cultural collaboration. As pointed out by Lloyd, Guitry enjoyed neither economic nor political power during the Occupation, and was guilty only of exploiting his association with the occupying powers to maintain his luxurious lifestyle and to continue his theatrical success.[473] Nonetheless, at the Liberation, he was one of the most high-profile cultural collaborators. A similar view can be adopted of Céline, whose infamy far out-stripped his actual wartime activity. In this, both targets for public disapproval can be seen to be accused of and bear the stigma of a level of collaboration in excess of their involvement with the enemy. For example, in Guitry's case, the accusation that he kept a statue of Hitler in the entrance lobby of his theatre is simply untrue.[474] These inflated claims can be seen as a possible motivator in drawing further similarity between Guitry and Céline, namely their paranoia about a vague and ill-defined 'them', who are motivated by jealousy and greed to undermine and attempt to destroy their careers by tainting them with outlandish claims of collaboration.

In fact, in Céline's case, and in spite of his reputation, it is hard to be precise about the nature of his collaboration, as 'the case of Céline is a classic illustration of how, in post-war France, the perception of collaboration outstripped hard evidence'.[475] Certainly, the facts of the case do not suggest Céline was the disreputable epitome

[472] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 77.
[473] *Ibid*., p. 77.
[474] Henry Gidel, *Les deux Guitry* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995), p. 410.
[475] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 251.

of collaboration the French believed him to be, and was far more of a fringe figure of the collaborationist world.[476] This is not to absolve him of involvement of collaboration, though, for he was also an able avoider of blame.[477] Evidence of this can be seen in *D'un Château l'autre*, where the narrator illustrates this point by making references to ridiculous claims made against him from the start of the novel,[478] seen as his only remaining 'privilege': '…de m'être croisé pour les Vrounzais, j'ai droit des affiches plein les murs, que je suis le traître fini, dépeceur de juifs, fourgueur de la Ligne Maginot, et de l'Indochine et de la Sicile… Oh, je me fais aucune illusion !... ils croient pas un mot de ces horreurs, mais une chose que je suis sûr, bel bien, c'est qu'ils m'harcèleront à la mort !... tête de turc des racistes d'en face ! matière première à propagande…'.[479]

The truth of the case lies between Céline's obfuscation of truth and the opposing extreme which linked him to the most acute cases of collaboration. He was, after much legal wrangling, charged on only two counts of collaboration: permitting the republication of *Bagatelles pour un massacre*, and for select passages in *Les Beaux Draps*. All other charges were conceded as unlikely to lead to prosecution, with the telling comment from the prosecutor that 'ni dans son attitude, ni dans ses écrits, on ne trouve trace d'une sympathie quelconque, ni pour l'Allemagne ni pour le regime de Vichy. Il semble en réalité qu'il ne se soit jamais préoccupé de qui que ce soit',[480] and this attitude can be seen to be mirrored in the one taken by the narrator in *D'un Château l'autre*. However, because of his views, he is often mentioned

[476] Julian Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 42.
[477] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 251.
[478] For a discussion of how closely the narrator Céline should be compared to the author Céline, and how and if the two can be separated, see below.
[479] Céline, *CA,* p. 8.
[480] François Gibault, *Céline, 3: 1944-1961: Cavalier de l'Apocalypse* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1985), p. 206.

within the same breath as, for example, Robert Brasillach (who was executed at the purge for his perceived intellectual and cultural collaboration) and Alphonse de Châteaubriant (who went into hiding at the Liberation to avoid justice).[481]

When compared with Brasillach and Châteaubriant, the character Céline presents in *D'un Château l'autre* can be seen as being unrepresentative of the mainstream cultural collaborator, lacking in both intellectual and practical support for the cause. This can partly be ascribed to the process of *l'épuration*, which gathered all writers together for trial without nuance.[482] Indeed, it has been noted that work examining the post-war trials of French intellectuals 'underlined their arbitrary and unjust nature'.[483] Whilst Brasillach is discussed elsewhere in this thesis,[484] the case of Châteaubriant provides an historical contrast to the image of the collaborator which Céline presents, with Châteaubriant engaging in activity that Céline's character would never consider. In the aftermath of the fall of France, Châteaubriant established the cultural review *La Gerbe*, with a circulation eventually reaching 100,000; he was also responsible for creating the *Groupe Collaboration*. The aim was to promote understanding between France and Germany through culture. This was achieved through visits of artists and intellectuals, cultural events, lectures and book readings, and through its journal, *Collaboration*. The perceived success of Châteaubriant's efforts can be seen through a report by Otto Abetz to Berlin in mid-1942, which stated that, with encouragement, collaborators would soon have the upper hand over the Gaullists in the battle for public opinion.[485] Yet it is not just Châteaubriant's public works which contrast with the protagonist which Céline has

[481] Ory, *Les collaborateurs*, p. 9.
[482] Pierre Assouline, *L'Épuration des intellectuels* (Brussels: Complexe, 1990), p. 105.
[483] Diane Rubenstein, 'Publish or perish: the épuration of French Intellectuals', *Journal of European Studies* 13 (1993), p. 71.
[484] See chapter one.
[485] Spotts, *The Shameful Peace*, p. 48.

created: the motivation for collaboration is also different. Châteaubriant can be seen to exhibit a blind faith and belief in collaboration, noticeably different from Céline's self-characterisation. For Châteaubriant, with a conservative Breton gentry background at odds with Céline's, collaboration was a near-religion, requiring similar blind devotion. His dream of a united Europe, Aryanised and free of Communism, never wavered. This dedication to a united Europe is lacking in Céline, and whilst the narrator of *D'un Château l'autre* is clearly anti-Semitic and anti-Communist, he does not believe that the world can be changed, and instead prefers to chronicle its failures in his eyes.

In spite of the differences between Céline's narrator and more orthodox collaborators such as Châteaubriant, however, Céline's creation is not a unique representation of writers or artists of the period. This can be partly seen by comparing Céline's writing style with that of other writers. As has been noted, his verve matches that of the French writer and critic Lucien Rebatet, also a noted Fascist, and pro-Nazi.[486] Additionally, the writing style of Céline, which can be seen as a somewhat disconnected stream of consciousness, mirrors the complicated, contradictory and conflicted views of Drieu La Rochelle, whose life was in such a constant state of change in terms of thought and activity that it is often difficult to discern a consistent viewpoint within his thinking.[487] Similarity to Celine's writing style reaches its apex in Drieu's diaries, written in an often-incoherent stream-of-consciousness, lurching from one contradictory and deeply unpleasant thought to another.[488] The content of the *Journal* further illustrates parallels with Céline's

[486] Michèle C. Cone, *Artists Under Vichy: A Case of Prejudice and Persecution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 20.
[487] Spotts, *The Shameful Peace*, p. 127.
[488] Drieu la Rochelle, Pierre, *Journal, 1939-45* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992).

narrator; its ever-present misanthropy linked closely with a strong element of *Schadenfreude*. Moreover, this enjoyment at the misery of others is directed often at groups which Céline's narrator also despises, including those blamed for France's ills: Jews, homosexuals, Freemasons, and politicians. This pervasive negativity, and the groups which are blamed for France's woes, are strongly evoked by Céline's narrator, and in this, *D'un Château l'autre* can be seen as highly representative of a type of intellectual collaborator motivated by nihilistic tendencies.

However, despite the over-riding pessimistic nature of the representations of both intellectual and cultural collaboration provided, they also contain some affirmative beliefs. The idea that society and democracy have ruined France (and, in Céline's case, continued to) is a theme which runs through the works of both authors, and in both cases the removal of this society and democracy can be seen as beneficial, which were also important themes in the wider field of cultural collaboration.[489] Moreover, and perhaps surprisingly in consideration of their views, both Céline (author and narrator) and Drieu La Rochelle can be seen in a sense as French patriots. Both were wounded in the First World War, fighting for France, and at the outbreak of World War Two both once again wished to serve their country, despite being physically unfit.[490] After the defeat, however, this patriotism did not lead to resistance, and both authors can be seen, post 1940, as accepting France's defeat and the Occupation. However, it was not simply this acceptance which earned both authors the label of collaborator; it was instead their ability and willingness to clearly and openly express their beliefs about issues such as collaboration and anti-

[489] Karlsgodt, *Defending National Treasures*, pp. 24-28.
[490] For Drieu la Rochelle's reaction to both World Wars, see Ory, *Les collaborateurs*, pp. 208-210. For Céline's reaction to World War Two, see Hewitt, *The Life of Céline*, p. 189.

Semitism, and in a highly public manner.[491] In both cases, the creativity of the individual and the use of their beliefs in their work lead to the taint of collaboration. However, whilst Drieu la Rochelle, Céline, and other authors did this both before and during the war, what marks Céline and his trilogy of novels about the war years out is the fact that they were written in the decades after the end of the war, and by doing so allow the reader to view part or all of France's wartime past.

Céline's reputation as a collaborator illustrates the difficult relationships that exist between fact and memory, and *D'un Château l'autre* and the trilogy of which it is part can be seen as a novel whose existence exemplifies this difficult relationship.[492] As already shown in reference to Céline, post-war judgements of collaboration could be difficult, and, for France as a whole, the trials of the purge failed to establish and define what exactly collaboration was.[493] This, in turn, allowed Céline greater ease in questioning the moral certainties of the war, which de Gaulle and his allies attempted to propagate. For Céline, the war is not a question of good versus evil. Indeed, this would be an oversimplification. For this author, there is a blurred distinction between the two, which would undermine the cynical viewpoint that is omnipresent throughout the work and which sees underhand motives in operation at all times in friend and foe alike. Whilst this avoidance of a Manichean vision is applied to collaborators, it is an attitude that is given greater creative freedom when applied to Céline's victorious enemies, for whilst dubious behaviour could have been expected by the reader on the part of the collaborator, the resistance and Allied powers have a pedestal from which to be

[491] As has been noted, those in cultural and intellectual circles of collaboration were high-profile cases, and were expressly made an example of during l'épuration. See Assouline, *L'Épuration des intellectuels*, p. 146.
[492] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 276.
[493] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 84.

toppled. On a personal level, this can be seen through the narrator's fixation on his stolen property, looted from his Parisian apartment at the Liberation in 1944. This theme, referred to throughout the work, features from the beginning of the novel, which simultaneously illustrates Céline's poor luck in being linked to the losing side, a fate he warns others of:

> On m'a tout volé à Montmartre!... tout !... rue Girardon!... je le répète… je le répéterai jamais assez !... on fait semblant de pas m'entendre… juste les choses qu'il faut entendre !... je mets pourtant les points sur les i… tout !... des gens, libérateurs vengeurs, sont entrés chez moi, par effraction, et ils ont tout emmené aux Puces !... tout fourgué !... j'exagère pas, j'ai les preuves, les témoins, les noms… tous mes livres et mes instruments, mes meubles et mes manuscrits !... tout le bazar !... j'ai rien retrouvé !... pas un mouchoir, pas une chaise !... vendu même les murs !... le logement tout ! soldés !... « Pochetée » ! tout est dit! Votre réflexion! Je vous entends !... bien naturelle ! oh, que ça vous arrivera pas ! rien de semblable vous arrivera ! que vos précautions sont bien prises ! … aussi communiste que le premier milliardaire venu, aussi poujadiste que Poujade, aussi russe que toutes les salades, plus américain que Buffalo !... parfaitement en cheville avec tout ce qui compte, Loge, Cellule, Sacristie, Parquet ![494]

Céline thus shows the narrator to have lost everything at the Liberation, a fate that could await many others, despite precautions taken. Indeed, this loss of property leads Céline to despise the profiteer and individual who has benefited from the war more than the resistance hero.[495] Instead of clear delineation between good and evil, with rewards in life reflecting these distinctions, it can be seen that the real divide is that between those who are lucky and those who are not. Thus, for the author, 'les Nazis étaient pas baisant mais dites-moi la douceur d'Europe ?'.[496] Similarly, this can be applied to wartime France: 'des « collabos » féroces ou « fifis » atroces épurateurs de ci…de ça… une chose, c'est qu'à Londres, Montmartre, Vichy,

[494] Céline, *CA*, p. 4.
[495] Hamel, *La Bataille des memoires*, p. 147.
[496] Céline, *CA*, p. 67.

Brazzaville, c'était méchants douteux partout!'[497] This blurring of lines is echoed in Céline's style. His malaria-stricken narrator employs a style which mirrors the blurred - so blurred as to be non-existent - concepts of past and present, and good and evil.

This paradigm of blurring issues can be seen to be encompassed within an overarching question on genre: what is *D'un Château l'autre* (and indeed the other works in the trilogy)? As previously discussed, the lines dividing the genres of history, autobiography and fiction can themselves be blurred; in some cases, to an extreme degree.[498] Céline's work can be seen as the example *par excellence* of this problem. The work can be seen as a form of historical representation, containing autobiographical traits (such as the author and narrator's anti-Semitism), as well as fictional elements (such as the narrator meeting the deceased Le Vigan, who emerges from the ghostly *bateau mouche*). Concurrently, arguments can be made to undermine the claims each genre has to subsume the work. The novel contains too many inaccuracies to be regarded as reliable as a work of history or autobiography (there was never an air raid on Sigmaringen, for example),[499] yet the representation provides an account that, whilst highly personalised, cannot be described as pure fiction. Can *D'un Château l'autre* be described as autofictive? The work certainly contains autofictional elements, but even this must be deemed an unsatisfactory blanket term, ignoring as it does the multifaceted nature of Céline's work.

---

[497] Céline, *CA,* p. 142.
[498] See chapter two.
[499] Indeed, this scene, with Pétain sheltering under a bridge from an air raid whilst out on an afternoon walk is contradicted by the narrator himself, who says that the allies failed to bomb Pétain because they did not want to.

D'un Château l'autre has been described as 'avowedly autobiographical',[500] and although this can be seen as incorrect, despite the form that the work takes, perhaps it would be apt to describe it as a chronicle, blending fact and fantasy.[501] It can be suggested that Céline the author uses Céline the narrator to create this fantasy, allowing confusion between the two to blend veracity with the desire to create a fictive work. Indeed, it would seem that by ignoring Céline the narrator, we can see a lack of constancy within Céline the man and author. Thus in a letter of 1948 he wrote: 'en vérité je n'aime pas écrire. J'ai ce jeu en horreur. Je suis médecin – je n'ai aucune vocation littéraire ! Écrivain me paraît un titre vaniteux, verbal et ridicule'.[502] Compare this sentiment with a 1947 letter, and the contradiction is clear: 'non rien ne me gêne pour travailler, aucune tragédie – vous savez les gens de ma génération (2 guerres) sont blasés à cet égard – même en cellule. Je bricolais des petits brouillons – Je n'irai pas jusqu'aux vers immortels sous la guillotine comme Chénier ! Mais chacun fait ce qu'il peut n'est-ce pas ?'.[503] To even gauge a verifiable truth from the words of Céline the man is therefore difficult; to do so through an autofictive narrator is almost impossible without recourse to independent sources. This is why it is perhaps best to view the work as a chronicle of its time, containing the flavour of the time which blends historical reality with creative ability to give something of the essence of the strange world of the

[500] J. H. Matthews, *The Inner Dream: Céline as Novelist* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1978), p. 156.
[501] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 274.
[502] Dominique de Roux and Michel Thélia (eds.), *Les Cahiers de L'Herne: Louis-Ferdinand Céline I* (Paris: Diffusion, 1963), p. 120.
[503] Michel Beaujour and Dominique de Roux (eds.), *Les Cahiers de L'Herne: Louis-Ferdinand Céline II* (Paris: Diffusion, 1965), p. 93.

displaced collaborator, waiting for the final catastrophe of the 1944 – 1945 period.[504]

D'un Château l'autre contains elements that suggest Céline was aware he was creating a work which took inspiration from a tradition of 'historical' writing. The narrator certainly sees himself as a partial source for such a work, proclaiming that he will write about the dead, and stories of the living will be left to someone else: 'je vous cite que des noms de personnes mortes… je laisse les survivants tranquilles… les morts suffisent !... ceux qui sont morts en Espagne… et ceux qui ont fini ailleurs… bien ailleurs !... les indiscrétions, Tacite s'en chargera !.. il est déjà né on dit… bon !...le Château, faudra qu'il se fie à moi…'.[505]

By referring to Tacitus, Céline clearly links himself to an older form of representation of the past; in particular, Tacitus' style, which employed narrative history as a story through which morality and dramatic scenes could be related to the reader, often portraying a deeply pessimistic view of human nature.[506] This link to the past is further supported when Céline describes the atmosphere at the Castle as being like the Middle Ages. Moreover, this link provides an explanation as to why the author would choose to adopt a style influenced by older chronicles: '…vous comprenez tout le Moyen-Âge si vous avez un peu vécu à Siegmaringen… l'envie, toute la haine des vilains, toute autour, crevant de toutes les pourritures,

[504] David Hayman, *Louis-Ferdinand Céline*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 42.
[505] Céline, *CA*, p. 112.
[506] Christopher S. van der Berg, 'Deliberative Oratory in the 'Annals' and the 'Dialogues', in Victoria Emma Pagán (ed.) *A Companion to Tacitus* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 190.

famines, froids, fièvres… les gens, les gâtés du Château avaient aussi des sentiments, des manières pour mater la plèbe…'[507]

The chronicle style is adopted to reflect a period not of the modern world, and just as the novel blurs good and evil, so too it blurs past and the present. The world that *D'un Château l'autre* deals with is, in a temporal sense, not wholly real, but at the same time is not wholly fictitious, and cannot be denied. In a similar way, the world of more extreme and committed collaborators was not the experience most of the French population experienced during the war, but its reality, as the author shows, cannot be escaped and must ultimately be accepted.

This situation is explicitly described by the author when he ascribes this strange world to its creator, who is not wholly the author Céline: 'la Chancellerie du Grand Reich avait trouvé pour les Français de Siegmaringen une certaine façon d'exister, ni absolument fictive, ni absolument réelle, qui sans engager l'avenir, tenait tout de même compte de passé… statut fictive, « mi-Quarantaine-mi-opérette »'.[508] Thus Siegmaringen, and Céline's strange world, can be seen as a creation of Hitler's Reich and Vichy, just as France, under the Occupation.[509] What makes the proceedings an operetta is the limited number of individuals who now provide the 'cast', caused by and reflective of their own and the Reich's fast-fading power. Yet, whilst the chronicle's focus on the past and Siegmaringen can be seen as a creation

[507] Céline, *CA*, p. 118. 'Siegmaringen' can be seen as sarcastic wordplay by the author on 'Sieg', the German for victory, as Sigmaringen is the correct spelling. Sigmaringen was the seat of the puppet Vichy government from August 1944 to the end of the war, and can thus be seen as a place to which the defeated French collaborators were consigned. For further information, see Henry Rousso, *Un Château en Allemagne. La France de Pétain en exil, Sigmaringen 1944-1945* (Paris: Ramsay, 1980).
[508] Céline, *CA*, p. 224.
[509] This can also be seen a symbol of Céline's powerlessness as a perceived cultural and intellectual collaborator, as it can for all other collaborators. The impending arrival of General Leclerc's troops hangs over Sigmaringen in 1944-5 and dominates the collaborators there, just as Abetz (and Hitler) have done throughout the war.

of the forces of the period, *D'un Château l'autre* is also a comment on the present. In particular, in its views on collaboration and the war, this non-chronological narrative adds to the sense of dislocation within the novel, narration slipping from period to period in a process Céline allows to be dictated by the fevered wanderings of the mind of the narrator: a metaphor for the period.[510]

This dislocation is partly achieved through the prevalence of death: McCarthy described the work as portraying life as a 'fragile kind of half-death'.[511] Whilst true, the converse is also in operation, for the dead can be viewed as half-alive through Céline's account, and collaboration can be seen as an over-riding factor in individual's lives that cannot be surmounted. This is shown in the actions of those who collaborated in intellectual and cultural spheres. Even when political power has been lost, cultural collaboration is still carried out and cultivated, even in a situation where all is lost. This is portrayed through the futile, comedic representation of Abetz planning a statue of Charlemagne for Paris, and also in his attempts to encourage Châteaubriant to write 'l'Ode à l'Europe', which will create 'une bombe morale' which, like Christianity, will revolutionize Europe.[512]

D'un Château l'autre is so concerned with conveying its tales of the past that, although Céline has nothing new to say, the narrator keeps talking merely because both he, and Céline the author, are unwilling to stay silent. Yet, it is precisely because these novels speak of a different age, in a voice unable to find anything new to say they must therefore remain held in temporal limbo. That *D'un Château l'autre* is important in light of this chapter is because of the interest in the historical

[510] Hewitt has made this observation in reference to *Nord*, but the point can clearly be made in relation to *D'un château l'autre*. Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 275.
[511] Patrick McCarthy *Céline* (London: Allen Lane, 1975), p. 291.
[512] Céline, *CA*, p. 231.

nature of the work, which Céline himself recognised and emphasised as a large part of the novel's attraction, which so directly challenges attempts to repress memories of collaboration (at the same time challenging the 'resistance myth').[513] Linked to this is the fact that the narrator's experience demands a hearing, and his unwillingness to remain silent, far from creating the boredom which a narrator who has nothing new to say might engender, instead creates a style that shows world-weariness, at the same time displaying a deep dislike for mankind, which provided an inspirational tool for Céline the writer.[514]

Memories and Knowledge of Collaboration

It is therefore suggested by *D'un Château l'autre*, with its blurring of past and present and the narrator's desire to repeat his experience (and for these experiences to be accepted by the French public), that memory and knowledge of collaboration were very much present, and that they are subjects of curiosity for the French.[515] Yet it is not just Céline (both the author and narrator) who is presented through the work; a whole selection of wartime 'ghosts' involved in collaboration return to reinforce the memory of collaboration. The list of ghosts (Pétain, Laval, Abetz, Châteaubriand and so forth) is long. However, the aspect of 'supernatural' return is most obvious in the case of Le Vigan,[516] shown on the *bateau mouche* with other collaborators early in the work.[517] This highlights the continuing presence of the

[513] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, p. 274.
[514] This can be seen in particular in his anti-Semitism. See below.
[515] Philippe Alméras, *Céline. Entre haines et passions* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1994), p. 415.
[516] A character based on the actor Robert Le Vigan, who fled to Spain and then Argentina after his release from imprisonment for collaboration in 1948. He died in 1972, so was alive at the time of the writing *D'un château l'autre*.
[517] McCarthy, *Céline,* p. 291.

past, for although they may be 'ghosts', these characters are still very much present. Moreover, little explanation is given of the background of historically verifiable people within the novel, implying that, at the time of publication, the author felt little explanation was needed; the public would recognise those represented and understand them from shared cultural knowledge. This in turn implies, through the understanding those portrayed are still known, that political and social judgements are still present. Céline, as author and narrator, shows himself through the work to reveal he is aware these judgements are still very much real. This understanding, that knowledge and judgement of collaboration have not been repressed, can be seen in the narrator's attempt to place collaborators within a typology which has historical precedent, as if to offer justification for collaboration. Collaborators were a type of individual who existed and were reborn from century to century, simply interested in power (a trait shared by those on the Allied side), as seen in the description of those who surround Abetz: 'on le voyait guère qu'entouré de « clients »… courtisans… clients-courtisans de toutes les Cours !... les mêmes ou leurs frères… vous pouvez aller chez Mendès… Churchill, Nasser ou Khrouchtchev… les mêmes ou leurs frères ! Versailles, Kremlin, Vel'd'Hiv, Salle des Ventes… chez Laval! De Gaulle!... vous pensez! éminences grises, voyous, véreux, Académistes ou Tiers État, pluri-sexués, rigoristes ou proxénétistes, bouffeurs de croûtons ou d'hosties, vous les verrez toujours sibylles, toujours renaissants, de siècle en siècle !... continuité des Pouvoirs !'[518]

The narrator takes a cynical view of the events around him. However, this does not detach him from those he is describing, for however much he criticises those he portrays, his personal hatreds – primarily his anti-Semitism – link him to those

[518] Céline, *CA*, p. 225.

described. This relies partly on knowledge external to the work and Céline's own past, for although the narrator's anti-Semitism is clear throughout, his views are not openly echoed by others: instead the reader's knowledge must link anti-Semitism to collaboration.[519] Céline's anti-Semitism is an important part of his writing, and it has been shown that this provided an impetus for his literary style, as Céline not only sustains but furthers his successful literary experimentation through his anti-Semitic polemic.[520] Moreover, the importance of Céline's continued use of anti-Semitism within his work (within the post-Holocaust period) also shows the power of language and style and the influence that it can have over the reader, for although his views are distasteful they did not lead to the rejection of his work by the public; indeed, the success of *D'un Château l'autre* surpassed all expectations.[521] This, in turn, is a comment by the author on an attempt to deal with collaboration. As collaboration is too powerful a factor, which will not go away, it must instead be accepted. Céline is a skilled writer in carrying this out, as he knows how to gain and hold attention. His use of dry humour and familiar language offers examples of this.[522] This is important, as it not only shows that former intellectual and cultural collaborators can have some control of their representation, but even more importantly that, to be represented to the French public, they did not need to negate unpalatable aspects of collaboration, or appear contrite, even if what they present is lamentable.[523]

In light of this it can be seen that Sigmaringen is represented as a series of variations on the theme of illusion, as Céline's cast of collaborators shows. As

[519] For Céline's wartime anti-Semitism see Alméras, *Céline*, p. 208-280.
[520] Hewitt, *Life of Céline,* p. 282.
[521] Gibault, *Céline 3, 1944 - 1961*, p. 312.
[522] McCarthy *Céline*, p. 285, p. 288.
[523] Hamel, *La Bataille des memoires*, p. 157.

discussed, Céline draws power through his ability to shape events he describes, even to the extent of openly resisting attempts by his publishers to correct his style and improve his image.[524] Nonetheless, this is not a power that allows for complete freedom, as the author shows that, however talented the artist, he cannot allow the individual to escape fate. In Sigmaringen, Laval draws power from being listened to,[525] as does Céline (as author and narrator), but this cannot ultimately alter the final reckoning. Laval's power is hollow. Le Vigan too, needs a role,[526] and can be seen as representative of intellectual and cultural collaboration: his performance is, and has been, his livelihood; he cannot exist without it. His role can be seen as symbolizing the wider fate of intellectual and cultural collaborators. Despite being played out, he has one last performance (like the rest of those at Sigmaringen), before exiting the stage.[527] Similarly, the intellectual collaborators at the Castle continue their endeavours in the Library, futile as their work may be,[528] and Céline continues in this vein later in the novel: 'à bien réfléchir, historique, Pétain, Debeney, étaient qui dirait, plus en scène! l'acte encore de « l'Empire Français »!... rideau!'[529] This shows the reader that, during the war he represents, the collaborators' imaginations run wild and lose sight of truth.[530]

In spite of this, Sigmaringen is not all illusion, with actors oblivious of the outside world. Some awareness of external issues, if not complete, has led them to become involved in collaboration, and to ultimately find themselves in the situation Céline represents in his work - hence Céline's claim that people who knew nothing and

[524] Hayman, *Céline*, p. 43.
[525] McCarthy *Céline*, p. 298.
[526] *Ibid*., p. 306.
[527] *Ibid*., p. 310.
[528] Céline, *CA*, p. 106.
[529] *Ibid*., p. 127.
[530] McCarthy *Céline*, pp. 290-291. Further individuals who are involved in fantasies involve Bichelonne, Orphize and de Chateaubriand.

avoided any involvement with hostilities ended in a good position at the close of the war, and only those (on either side) who became involved risked something. Does this mark collaborators out from Céline, and imply to the reader that he has a greater hold on reality? Certainly, Céline, as both author and narrator, employs hindsight, the narrator seemingly keen to emphasise the distance between himself and those around him, stating that he is not trusted because he is not involved with any particular grouping.[531] This, however, leads to us asking whether Céline knew that no matter how inventive he was, he was tied in people's minds to the collaborators in the novel. Certainly he attempts to create an impression of being 'apart' from and different to the occupants of the Castle and town, pointing out his role as a doctor,[532] rather than author, associated with and guilty of collaboration. Yet these points should not be read as attempts to justify the narrator's presence, distancing himself from the events and views held at Sigmaringen. Céline instead relies on a self-awareness and otherness that others appear not to pocess, differentiating him from other characters. Moreover, Céline does not attempt to link his name to any form of resistance activity which would in some way distance himself from the collaborators he was involved with, although this has been noted as a large-scale phenomenon amongst those whose experiences were recorded.[533]

There was a (sadly unfulfilled) possibility towards the end of Céline's life that *Voyage au bout de la nuit* could have been made into a film by Louis Malle.[534] Had this come to fruition, and Malle had instead made a picture of *D'un Château l'autre*, he would surely have exceeded the controversy surrounding his film of his

[531] Céline, *CA*, p. 132. This independence is backed in his political views, such as his lack of belief in a 'New Europe': see p. 205.
[532] *Ibid.,* p. 131.
[533] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 79.
[534] Hewitt, *Life of Céline,* p. 277.

and Modiano's co-written *Lacombe Lucien* at a much earlier time.[535] Whilst this can be seen as speculation, it underlines a serious point: long before the *mode rétro* and its supposed reawakening of repressed memories, cultural forums were openly discussing French collaboration during the war. Indeed, had there been an author and a work to stir repressed memories, Céline and *D'un Château l'autre* would surely have been prime candidates. Yet it was not only Céline himself who recognised his unique position as an author to provide representation of these events, as both publisher and public interest in the book confirmed. For a novel by a seemingly still-unrepentant anti-Semite, representing not only these views but a description of some of war's most notorious collaborators, to be not only deemed acceptable but even moderately critically and comercially successful (compared with Céline's previous pre-war novels)[536] suggests a viable alternative view of the past to the Gaullist hegemony of memory Rousso suggests.

What made the novel the success it was? McCarthy has pointed out Céline's attraction to the creative-destructive process,[537] and it may well be that his audience, too, were attracted to this. The end of the war, especially in Germany, was a strange period, and one of dark myths. This attraction to the creative/destructive process can be seen as vitally important, and the blossoming of the cultural and intellectual world (most notably in Paris) under the destructive Occupation has now become a cliché. Céline, and *D'un Château l'autre* (alongside the rest of the trilogy) can be seen as a living post-war embodiment of this: the author draws his creativity from the war, at the same time showing how much the

[535] For a discussion of the 'controversy' surrounding *Lacombe Lucien*, see Rousso *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 152, pp. 268-269.
[536] Hewitt, *Life of Céline*, pp. 276-277.
[537] McCarthy *Céline*, p. 311.

intellectual and cultural world may have been involved. France simply did not and could not repress, at any point, mass involvement in war, which is why the work was not condemned on release. Céline is aware that this past has not been forgiven by its victims, but remains, to some extent, defiant, knowing how people were curious about Sigmaringen.[538] Céline also illustrates the problems of working in war – and, although this was not just an issue that applied to high-profile cultural and intellectual collaboration, but also to all other forms of collaboration – his own work clearly associated him with the occupying forces in the public's imagination.[539]

Conclusion

Returning one last time to the theme of repression that Rousso claims typifies the period, Céline has been described as an author who 'denies history its gravity',[540] which on the surface would appear to be the opposite to de Gaulle, the 'embodiment of resistance' and wartime France, which Rousso would suggest was the potent myth of the period. But, crucially, in the post-war world, Céline and de Gaulle, who could be seen as providing wartime memory the necessary gravity, were more similar than either the author or general would care to admit.[541] The links are manifold: de Gaulle's interest in France's *grandeur* compared with Céline's obsession with France's decline, their religious temperaments, dedication to 'truth', their ability, alone, to 'predict' the future, a shared ability to created legendary status around their persons, and ability to arouse hostility (largely founded in their wartime career and subsequent exploitation of it). They are even

[538] Céline, *CA*, p. 32.
[539] McCarthy, *Céline*, p. 313.
[540] Matthews, *The Inner Dream*, p. 167.
[541] McCarthy, *Céline*, pp. 315-6.

both, importantly, images of a former France. This can be seen in the mundane detail of their reliance on period dress to reinforce their image: de Gaulle in his uniform of the rank of 1940, and Céline in his shabby pre-war suits. But it is not simply a matter of dress; they both represent the past in a wider sense: Céline, of (at least perceived) intellectual and cultural collaboration; de Gaulle, of resistance. This in turn raises the question of who presented the more 'truthful' replication. This is not to imply there is either a representation of the past based on either a resistance or collaboration understanding of the past, but to question whose interpretation stands wide-scale historical scrutiny. Neither can claim to be comprehensive, but in terms of representative facts, Céline would appear to have the upper hand. De Gaulle's version of the past, based on supposed wartime experience – which Rousso accepts as holding dominance – is based on the denial of a large part of France's wartime experience: namely, collaboration, and any exploration of it. Céline may not stand for the majority in his representation of the past, but it is, crucially, largely free from denial (although his anti-Semitism is tempered). Nor is his work unique. Other novels, such as Chevallier's 1958 *La Première Pierre* similarly examine cultural collaboration (in this case through the character of Etienne, who writes for a collaborationist journal and ends the war imprisoned in Drancy).[542] *D'un Château l'autre* 'communicates a sense of meaning' of the past,[543] which was as believable as the resistance myth in 1957 when the novel was published and it is today, also offering a clear illustration of the caricatured view of the vice of collaboration as opposed to the virtue of resistance which had long taken hold of the public's imagination.[544] Moreover, amongst a

[542] Simone Chevallier, *La Première Pierre* (Paris: Pierre Horay, 1958).
[543] Matthews, *The Inner Dream*, p. 172.
[544] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France*, p. 159.

wider selection of novels which are 'not a cozy or nostalgic history' of the war years but rather 'a history of dissension, conflict, and anxiety',[545] it captures an essence of intellectual and cultural collaboration which, when taken with historical knowledge, presents a more believable picture than that presented by de Gaulle.

[545] Margaret Atack, 'Representing the Occupation in the Novel of the 1950s: *Ne jugez pas*', *Cincinnati Romance Review* 29 (2010), p. 86.

Chapter Five: Representations of Military and Paramilitary Collaboration

As noted in the previous chapter, the years 1954 to 1971 were seen by Henry Rousso as a period when the governing elite sought to calm memories of past divisions. Essential to this was the creation of a myth to downplay these divisions, which in turn required the repression of any difficult memories of the war years. This repression reached its apogee with the return of de Gaulle to power in 1958 and the creation of the Fifth Republic. The years of his political dominance marked a time when France was subjected to the 'Gaullist myth', when repression of wartime memories of collaboration was aided by the conditions of *les trente glorieuses*, and, of *la République gaullienne*, when an increasing affluence allowed more and more French men and women to enjoy the fruits of post-war prosperity.[546]

The 'Gaullist myth' identified by Rousso can be outlined as seeing minimal wartime collaboration, with those involved uncharacteristic of French opinion and activity as a whole. Instead, France was essentially unified and patriotic; her interests protected by an élite of Resistance fighters, supported by the nation as a whole, and personified by de Gaulle as 'le premier Résistant de France'. Thus, the 'Gaullist myth' tended to minimize the role of Vichy and support it commanded amongst the French population, and instead created a new object of memory, the Resistance.[547]

However, as expected, this understanding of the past was not immutable. 1964 is seen by Rousso as marking a watershed year, when the 'Gaullist myth' left behind

[546] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 115-117.
[547] *Ibid*., pp. 89-92.

exorcisms of the past and turned its attention to the future: 'l'heure était sans doute venue, pour un gaullisme sorti de l'épreuve, d'ancrer sa légitimité dans un passé sublime. Après le temps de l'exorcisme, vient celui de l'«honneur inventé»'.[548] In essence, 'il ne s'agit plus simplement d'organiser l'oubli de la guerre franco-française, mais d'orienter le souvenir et de forger une mémoire officielle à la mesure de la «grandeur» renaissante du pays'.[549] Reasons for this new direction of understanding the past included the twentieth anniversary of liberation, and the healing of both the new wounds of the Algerian war and the old ones of the Occupation. This new memory was based on the notion of France as a country which would always resist the invader, and was given active representation in the interment of Jean Moulin the Resistance hero. The purported remains of Moulin were interred in the Pantheon during a two-day ceremony which involved France's civil and military representatives (and which also marked the twentieth anniversary of the Liberation).

André Malraux, the Minister for Culture, gave a speech at this event which vocalised the symbolism of the occasion, and which was 'situé au carrefour entre l'Histoire, la mémoire et l'épopée'[550] by the use of a simple equation that explained not only France's past, but also its future in light of this past. If the Resistance equalled de Gaulle, and de Gaulle equalled France, the Resistance equalled France. From the past, the example of the *résistants* provided inspiration for the concept of the Resistance which equalled France, and subsisted in the sphere of immanence, epic and edifying abstraction, found in the realm of dreams and ideals.

[548] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 101.
[549] *Ibid*., p. 101.
[550] *Ibid*., p. 109.

This concept deliberately negated the role of the individual. This was not to claim that individuals were not important (these ideas were, after all, given full vent at a ceremony in honour of one man, Jean Moulin), but that their actions went towards supporting the higher unifying ideals expressed by the Resistance. This in itself was primarily a military action, continuing to fight after 1940 in the tradition of Verdun, the First World War battle of attrition in which the French finally won a tactical victory at appalling loss of life. This way of viewing the past seemingly benefited the Gaullist understanding in two ways. Firstly, the *guerre franco-française* (the conflict between suporters of collaboration and those of resistance, which reached its height at the time of the Liberation) could be overlooked, as the mission of the army (which, in de Gaulle's eyes, the resistance was) primarily focused on fighting foreign enemies instead of a small number of domestic traitors.[551] Secondly, it allowed political and ideological divisions in the Resistance to be overlooked.[552]

Thus, the 1960s, according to Rousso, saw a period where memories were dominated by the Gaullist version of the past. As early as the 1950s people wished to lay controversy to rest, and de Gaulle's view enabled this perfectly, leading Rousso to make the confident claim that 'toute une generation s'est accommodée de l'image imposée par le gaullisme, négligeant les voix discordantes qui s'expriment ici ou là'.[553] But, did a generation undeniably embrace the Gaullist image, with only a few discordant voices going unheard? Was this consensual view of the past open to challenge? Germane to this issue, and to this chapter, is the memory of military

[551] As Julien Jackson has noted, although the conflict became increasingly violent, it should not be considered a civil war as occurred in countries such as Italy. Only a tiny number of people were involved, with the Resistance gaining the sympathy of the population as a whole. Whilst 'the Maquis was feared, the Milice was both feared and detested'. Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, pp. 534-535.
[552] Rousso *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 110.
[553] *Ibid*., p. 117.

and paramilitary collaboration. If the Resistance was involved in fighting a foreign enemy, were memories of 'a handful of traitors' (who took part in the civil war prior to and at the time of the Liberation) negligible and insignificant within war novels? Does their representation match Rousso's thesis of political narrative? Moreover, where do memories of those who fought with France's occupiers outside of France fit into Rousso's schema? Do they, aside from challenging the myth of a France united behind the Resistance's military activities against the occupier, allow an investigation of the role of the individual and their relationship to war which counteracts the negation of the individual and undermines the unifying ideals of the Gaullist memory?

Novels have once again been selected to explore these particular facets of collaboration, which in turn challenge Rousso's conception of memories of the war. For this chapter, Saint-Loup's 1964 *Les Hérétiques* (an account of the military activities of French members of the Waffen SS in the closing stages of the war), Patrick Modiano's 1969 *La Ronde de Nuit* (whose narrator works for both the Resistance and the paramilitary Gestapo française) and Michel Tournier's 1970 *Le Roi des Aulnes* (a story in which the principal character develops from a garage mechanic to a member of the *Nationalpolitischen Erziehungsanstalten* by the close of the war, in charge of a paramilitary training school for Hitler Youth) have been selected. Although these novels are incongruent in terms of style, their subject matter provides broad coverage of both military and paramilitary collaboration within, as well as outwith, France. As noted, thousands who collaborated fought for a German victory outside of France, in places such as Belorussia, Galicia,

Pomerania, and Berlin, and their memory is a relatively unexplored one.[554] Therefore, whilst the primary focus on collaboration within this thesis has been on activities within metropolitan France, because of the importance of military collaboration outside of France, service within Germany and on the Eastern Front will also be examined.

Yet before these novels are considered, note must be taken of the period c. 1964 to c. 1971 covered by this chapter, for it deals in part with a key change in Rousso's theory. As noted above, the year 1964 marked the apex of the Gaullist view of the past. However, this year is eclipsed as a turning point in the way the war years were understood by the dramatic events of 1968, critically seen as having led to a re-examination of the past by a new generation who had little or no first-hand experience of the war years and which 'a clamé bruyamment son refus d'une certaine société. Donc, implicitement, celui d'une certaine vision de son histoire'.[555] This questioning of the past was a process which reached fruition in 1971, which is the year that marks the beginning of Rousso's next phase, *Le miroir brisé*, with key events including the release of *Le Chagrin et la pité* in 1971 and the death of President Pompidou in 1974. Therefore it must be made clear that whilst de Gaulle's views dominated during this period and are the subject of this chapter, the seeds of change had been firmly planted during the latter part of the phase under consideration and were developing before the end of the period.[556] As in previous chapters, the novels will be used to explore an alternative view of the past than that described by Gaullists during the period, and will be shown to be neither as

[554] Carrard, *The French Who Fought For Hitler,* pp. 1-2, p. 8.
[555] Rousso *Syndrome de Vichy,* p. 118. For further information on the cultural impact of the riots of 1968, and their effect on history, see Margaret Atack, *May '68 in French fiction and film*.
[556] Rousso *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 118-121.

repressed, nor as atypical as they should have been, were they to fit in with Rousso's study of political dialogue. As the resistance was seen as part of France's wartime armed forces, the particular aspect of collaboration explored will be military and paramilitary collaboration, which will provide the clearest and most contradictory alternative to the Gaullist view. Therefore, and for clarity, issues dealing with developments assumed to have their origins in the events of 1968 will be dealt with in the next chapter on the period c.1971-1974, which will maintain that the new view of the past that Rousso argues for was not an innovative phenomenon.

The Authors and Background Context

It is also worth briefly considering the biographical details of their authors before the novels themselves are examined. Saint-Loup (the pseudonym of Marc Augier, born 1908, died 1990) can be seen as the writer with the most direct experience of his subject matter.[557] Saint-Loup first became interested in Germany during a trip there in 1929, and although initially a socialist, became a supporter of fascism in 1937 after reading the novel *La Gerbe des forces* by the future collaborator Châteaubriant.[558] This pre-war novel can be seen to foreshadow Saint-Loup's later work, celebrating the epic nature of the camaraderie amongst the Nazis, who are seen as 'les suprêmes chevaliers d'un suprême ordre teutonique', whilst the Nazi Party itself represents 'tout ce qui fut l'ordre des chevaleries d'Europe'.[559] This

[557] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 4.
[558] Jérôme Moreau, *Sous le signe de la roue solaire: Itinéraire politique de Saint-Loup* (Paris: L'Æncre, 2002), p. 52.
[559] Alphonse de Châteaubriant**,** *La Gerbe des forces* (Paris: Grasset, 1937), p. 305.

attraction to Nazi military can be seen as part of Saint-Loup's motivation to join the LVF in October 1941 (leaving Châteaubriant's *La Gerbe* newspaper to do so).[560] Châteaubriant himself was a member of the central committee of the LVF.[561] Following service in the LVF, Saint-Loup joined the French Waffen SS as an assigned press correspondent, reporting on the fighting on the Eastern Front. The author was also responsible for *Devenir*, the official publication of the French Waffen SS.[562] It can certainly be seen that Saint-Loup saw his works as conveying his version of history through fiction, even if there are notable gaps in his history.[563]

Michel Tournier (born 1924) learned German at an early age while staying each summer in Germany, and had an education deeply influenced by the interest of his parents in German culture and music.[564] Although Tournier was slightly too young to become involved in France's defeat in 1940, his presence in Paris and Saint Germain-en-Laye during the war allowed him to witness Occupation first-hand.[565] During this period he not only noted the esteem in which many held the Germans, but also the unquestioning support offered by the French nation to Pétain. Therefore, because of his life in Paris during the years of conflict, it has been noted that 'at the war's end, he observed how all these events were rapidly fictionalised and transformed into the myth of "La France résistante"'.[566] It is therefore clear that from an early stage Tournier did not believe in the Gaullist Myth. In the immediate aftermath of the war, as part of his studies, Tournier travelled to Germany, and such

[560] Kay Chadwick, *Alphonse de Châteaubriant: Catholic collaborator* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2002), p. 150.
[561] Ibid., p. 18.
[562] Moreau, *Sous le signe,* pp. 181-182.
[563] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 5.
[564] Maurice de Gandillac, 'De quelques mythes germaniques', in Arlette Bouloumié and Maurice de Gandillac (eds.), *Images et signes de Michel Tournier: actes du colloque de Cerisy* (Paris: Gaillmard, 1990), pp. 42-45.
[565] For an example of the author's own account of the war years, see Michel Tournier, *Le vent Paraclet* (Paris: Gallimard, 1977), pp. 73-84.
[566] William Cloonan, *Michel Tournier* (Boston, MA: Twayne, 1985), p. 2.

was his interest in the country he stayed for four years, rather than the intended four weeks.[567] In later years he went on to become a celebrated writer, winning the *Grand Prix du roman de l'Académie française* in 1967 for his first novel, *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique* and the *Prix Goncourt* for *Le Roi des aulnes* in 1970. However, although *Vendredi* was Tournier's first published novel, the beginning of his work on *Le Roi des aulnes* actually antedates that of *Vendredi*. As Tournier was unable to reduce the novel to manageable size, work on it was abandoned twice, in 1958 and 1962, illustrating the novel's long gestation. Moreover, this shows its cultural genesis can be dated to well before 1968, and instead belongs to the period of the supposed repression of memories of collaboration.

Whilst both Saint-Loup and Tournier witnessed the war in person, Patrick Modiano, born in 1945, did not.[568] Despite this, Modiano's works illustrate a deep interest in the past, as well as being critically important vehicles through which people are able to engage with the Occupation. Moreover, Modiano's output was critically well-received. His 1969 *La Ronde de Nuit*, forming part of the focus of this chapter, was the second instalment of a highly polemical set of three novels about the Occupation which also included his first novel, the 1968 *La Place de l'Étoile*, which won both the Prix Roger Nimier and the Prix Fénéon, as well as his 1972 *Les Boulevards de ceinture*, winner of the *Grand prix du roman de l'Académie française*.

Before turning to an examination of these texts, it is necessary to give a brief overview of the types of military and paramilitary activity that the French could

[567] Colin Davis, *Michel Tournier: Philosophy and Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 1.
[568] As he is identified as a key author of *la Mode rétro*, Patrick Modiano's family background and effect on his relationship with the past is discussed at greater length in the next chapter in relation to *Les Boulevards de ceinture*.

engage with. The LVF was the first of three military organisations which fought for the Germans. Founded in August 1941, December of that year saw action near Moscow, and from February 1942 to June 1944, the LVF was primarily used against Belorussian partisans. The second group was the Achte Französische SS-Freiwilligen Sturmbrigade (or Brigade Frankreich), created in July 1943. The Brigade fought against Russia in Galicia in August 1944, before retreating to East Prussia. The final main military organisation was the Dreiunddreißigste Waffen-Grenadier-Division der SS Charlemagne (or simply Division Charlemagne), which is the focus of *Les Hérétiques*. This was created in 1944, taking men from both previous groups. The Division Charlemagne fought as part of the desperate attempts to contain the Russian advance in Pomerania in February and March 1945, and a few survivors of these battles fought in the Battle of Berlin in April and May 1945.[569] These organisations were, however, not the only means by which the French could militarily collaborate, with other organisations such as the Phalange Africaine, which fought the Allies in North Africa in 1943, being possibilities.[570]

Whilst these forces fought overseas, away from metropolitan France, paramilitary organisations saw action within France itself, participating in the *guerre franco-française*. The most militaristic of these was the Milice (and in particular its military wing, the Franc Garde), created on 30 January 1943 by the French State to serve as an auxiliary body to the occupying German army.[571] The Milice became increasingly important in late 1943, and in the run-up to the Liberation, hunting down maquisards. Its commander was Joseph Darnand, a decorated hero of both the

[569] Philippe Carrard 'From the Outcasts' Point of View: The Memoirs of the French Who Fought for Hitler', *French Historical Studies* 31 (2008), pp. 478-479.
[570] For further information and a comprehensive list, see Pierre Philippe Lambert and Gérard Le Marec, *Les Français sous le casque allemand* (Paris: Jacques Grancher, 1994).
[571] For further information and a general discussion of the Milice, see Jean-Pierre Azéma, 'La Milice', *Vingtième siècle, revue d'histoire* 28 (1990), pp. 83-105.

First World War and veteran of the fight against the Germans in 1940. However, as head of the Milice he took an oath of loyalty to Hitler in October 1943 and received the rank of *Sturmbannführer* in the Waffen SS.[572] By 1944, the French Milice had between 25,000 and 30,000 members.[573]

Aside from the Milice, it was also possible to work for various collaborating police forces. For example, the Groupe mobile de réserve, a paramilitary force of the French State created by René Bousquet, was a police version of the Milice, and aided both the Milice and German army in their battles against the maquisards, notable the Maquis du Vercors in early 1944.[574] Far less military was the Carlingue (a familiar name for the French Gestapo), run by Henri Lafont and Pierre Bonny, providing the setting for *La Ronde de Nuit*. Both Lafont and Bonny, together with their organisation, were little better than gangsters operating with the acquiescence of the occupying Germans, and engaged in both black market activities as well as torture; their torture chambers at 93 rue Lauriston in Paris' 16th *arrondissement* became notorious for the horrific crimes carried out there. The Carlingue's primary roles were to seek out French Jews and fight the French Resistance, in conjunction with other French military and paramilitary organisations, as well as German occupying forces. Members of the Carlingue were auxiliary members of the Gestapo, the secret state police of Nazi Germany and the occupied countries.[575] In total it has been estimated there were approximately 10,000 French members of German police units, who controlled up to 30,000 civilian auxiliaries and

[572] Gordon, 'Un soldat du fascisme', pp. 43-70.
[573] Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 231.
[574] Anna Balzarro, *Le Vercors et la zone libre de l'Alto Tortonese – Récits, mémoire, histoire* (Paris: Harmattan, 2003), p. 42.
[575] Within this thesis 'Gestapo' is used to simplify a complex police hierarchy. For further information, see Renaud de Rochebrune and Jean-Claude Hazera, *Les Patrons sous l'Occupation,* (Paris: Broché, 1995), pp. 182-246, and Jacques Delarue, *Trafics et crimes sous l'Occupation* (Paris: Broché, 1988), pp. 17-142.

informers.[576] Whilst as a percentage of the French population this was small, their influence gave them far greater relevance to people's lives than their numbers suggest.

Motivations: Active Support for Military and Paramilitary Collaboration

One of the key issues these novels explore is the motivations of those either supporting or actively involved in activities contrary to those adopted by de Gaulle and the Resistance, within a nation which, after the defeat of 1940, could be considered anti-militaristic.[577] The novels selected examine in some depth the background and inspiration of those who engage in these forms of collaboration, with participation explored to illustrate a range of degrees of involvement, ranging from forms of active and wilful desire for involvement to passive and almost accidental involvement. Such involvement can be most clearly seen in *Les Hérétiques*, which is one of a series of novels which form a sub-genre of pro-Nazi literature. Set during the final months of the war, *Les Hérétiques* details the activities of a group of French protagonists within the SS Charlemagne Division, including the last desperate defence of Berlin during which remnants of French military collaborators were amongst the final defenders of Hitler's bunker. As can be inferred from the desperation of this action, the protagonists still cling to the ideals which initially encouraged them to volunteer in the earlier stages of the war, even if the regime in which they believed was clearly on the verge of total collapse.

---

[576] Chris Bishop, *Hitler's Foreign Divisions: Foreign Volunteers in the Waffen-SS, 1940–1945* (Staplehurst: Spellmount, 2005).
[577] Christian Bachelier 'L'Arnée', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.) *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992), p. 401.

This point is made explicit by Saint-Loup within his foreword: 'les hommes que nous présentons dans *Les Hérétiques* étaient les avocats d'une cause idéologique'.[578]

However, despite the setting of the novel - the final defeat of the Third Reich and the destruction of its remaining armed forces - many characters can be seen as going beyond simple ideological support, and in many cases the physical bravery of many of those involved can be seen as crossing into fanatical zeal, beyond rational explanation. Displaying such zeal within his characters, Saint-Loup presents his protagonists as 'véritables héros wagnériens'.[579] Yet in spite of this fanaticism, the characters within *Les Hérétiques* are not necessarily fighting at this point as a positive act of affirmation in their beliefs. As the narrator states, 'ce n'est pas le « Heil Hitler » des Allemands, le « Huré Staline » des Russes, mais tout simplement l'expression d'un esprit héréditairement revendicatif'.[580] This act of protest, without real support for any cause at this stage of the war, further illustrates this lack of affirmation, and gives Saint-Loup's characters a nihilistic quality. In this sense, Saint-Loup's soldiers can be seen as 'bad' combatants fighting on even after all hope is lost. As Carrard has pointed out, it would have been more sensible to surrender and end, as quickly as possible, the suffering the war had brought, rather than helping the Nazis ensure Germany 'disappear in a spectacular inferno'.[581]

However, Carrard goes on to develop this point, illustrating that there could sometimes be beneficial motives behind continuing to fight when the situation was hopeless. At this point Saint-Loup's work can be compared in its representation to

[578] Saint-Loup, *LH*, p. 10. It should also be noted that *Les Hérétiques* is one of a series of novels which form a sub-genre of pro-Nazi literature.
[579] Francis Bergeron, *Saint-Loup* (Grez-sur-Loing: Pardès, 2010), p. 43.
[580] Saint-Loup, *LH*, pp. 25-6.
[581] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 157.

Guy Sajer's auto-fictive *Le Soldat oublié*, which recounts the story of a new *malgré nous* conscript from Alsace from the point of joining the German Army in 1942, through the bitter Russian campaign, to the end of the war.[582] The narrator describes the desperate battle which took place in East Prussia, whilst attempts were made to save the civilian population, terrified of advancing Russian armies.[583] In this sense, the duty to fight on can be seen to be the correct action in such a situation, and justifies continued efforts to continue combat, even though defeat seems imminent:

> Nous avons aidé de vieilles personnes, que des plus jeunes avaient déjà abandonnées aux Soviets. Dans la nuit éclairée des lueurs provenant de la guerre, nous avons accompli encore une fois notre devoir. Nous avons soutenu et porté des vieillards vers la port où un bateau les attendait. Les avions sont, hélas ! passés, et, se fiant aux incendies qui ravagent les côtés de la voie, ils ont encore lâché la mort sur notre dévouement. Ils nous en ont tué une quinzaine. Nous avons bien essayé de les entraîner dans nos plongeons successifs, mais les vieilles personnes n'ont pu nous suivre. Ça ne fait rien, nous en avons sauvé pas mal. Avec mes copains, nous les avons pratiquement hissés sur un chalutier. Nous avons aidé à les entasser parmi la foule innombrable et, entre-temps, le bateau a largué ses amarres pour échapper à une attaque aérienne.[584]

This passage shows that soldiers such as Sajer owed responsibility to the civil population, and particularly to elements of the civil population unable to fend for themselves in such desperate situations.[585] Such a passage, which shows the military in the light of defenders of the weak actively fulfilling this responsibility, also illustrates both the comradeship of the military unit and the bravery of those involved. This is common to the works of both Sajer and Saint-Loup. However, whilst Saint-Loup shows much of the military struggle within *Les Hérétiques* to be

[582] For further information on the malgré nous, see Eugène Riedweg, *Les «Malgré nous»: Histoire de l'incorporation de force des Alsaciens-Mosellans dans l'armée Allemande* (Strasbourg: la Nuée Bleue, 2008).
[583] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 157.
[584] Guy Sajer, *Le Soldat oublié* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1967), p. 673.
[585] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 158.

part of the glorious and Wagnerian last stand of the Third Reich, Sajer avoids glossing the grim realities of the Eastern Front with such a pretence.

What both authors do show is the personal courage required of many of those who fought against the Soviets. This can be compared to the service record of Jacques Doriot, who founded the LVF with collaborator Marcel Déat, and who fought on the Eastern Front. Doriot had been awarded the Croix de Guerre in the First World War, and also served in the French Army prior to the French defeat of 1940. The award of the Croix de Guerre was later given an ironic twist, as due to his later collaboration Doriot was also awarded the Iron Cross in 1943.[586] Aside from the comparison between Doriot's bravery, and that which Saint-Loup represents through his characters within *Les Hérétiques*, both men can be described as political soldiers, who had followed a similar journey. Although Saint-Loup had never been a member of the Communist party, as Doriot had, he had come, through his experiences with the Centre Laïc des Auberges de Jeunesse, to greatly dislike the Communist Party and the Left.[587] Moreover, in the cases of both men, their dislike led them to embrace a radical form of politics which included embracing the Third Reich and its policies.[588]

Saint-Loup's previous journalistic career, which motivated him to fight alongside the combatants as a press reporter, and the portrayal of his characters in his later novels, also illustrates the differences and similarities between collaboration and collaborationism.[589] Those who supported collaboration as a tool of expediency

[586] James G. Shields, 'Charlemagne's Crusaders: French Collaboration in Arms, 1941-1945', *French Cultural Studies* 18 (2007), p. 89. For further information on Doriot's life story, see Jean-Paul Brunet, *Jacques Doriot* (Paris: Balland, 1986).
[587] Bergeron, *Saint-Loup*, pp. 16-18.
[588] Moreau, *Sous le signe*, p, 11.
[589] Shields, 'Charlemagne's Crusaders', p. 84.

believed far more in finding an accommodation with the occupying Germans within France. Those who supported collaborationism were motivated more by ideological belief, and were willing actively to support the Germans both within France and abroad against their enemies. Therefore, Saint-Loup's military characters who willingly fight for the Germans can be seen as typifying individuals who represented best the quandary in which the Vichy government found itself. How was Vichy to retain its sovereign authority over France whilst both individuals and groups within the state were willing to form relationships with the occupiers well beyond the levels Vichy wished to countenance? This undermined any claim the Vichy government might have had to autonomy. Despite this importance, the number of those who fought in the LVF and, later, the SS Charlemagne division (as well as in other military units) was small, estimated at around 40,000.[590] Moreover, this number is also indicative of the lack of support which military and paramilitary collaboration received from the population at large.[591] Yet they were a significant and visible suggestion of ever deepening collaboration on behalf of the French state, just as Saint-Loup had, as a journalist (prior to military service), represented an important part of the highly visible minority of intellectual collaborationists.[592]

Saint-Loup has been described as a 'Don Quixote in search of an ideal', and it can be that the protagonists within *Les Hérétiques* have become involved in their military collaboration because they have sought and found such an ideal.[593] However, Saint-Loup's representation of a group of comrades in arms fighting for this ideal also leads to an idealised representation of the past. His representation of

[590] Lambert and Le Marec, *Les Français sous le casque allemand*, p. 240.
[591] Delarue *Trafics et crimes*, p. 235.
[592] Ory, *Les collaborateurs*, p. 243-244.
[593] Bertram Gordon, *Collaborationism in France*, p. 257.

the Waffen SS is limited to a heroic stereotype; a celebration of comradeship and personal bravery in the face of daunting odds. Through such representation, Saint-Loup is essentially 'laundering' the past.[594] Through literary representation he attempts to normalise and make acceptable those who fought for the Nazis. What gives his representation added piquancy is that Saint-Loup is clearly writing as a known figure, as well as a participant whose own experience lies at the centre of, and lends veracity to, the story.[595] Beyond this, the author also attempts to create the impression he is a reliable witness in both his preface, through the use of footnotes to explain the historical background of comments not be readily known to the reader (usually the preserve of scholarly works), and through the use of maps to support the text.[596] Such paratextual elements are used by the author to add authenticity to his fictionalised history.

Therefore, rather like a reliable witness to a crime, it appears that Saint-Loup provides an accurate account of what he is describing. This is undermined by further examination of the evidence, however, at which point it becomes clear that instead of being merely a witness, he is an accomplice to the crimes he is attempting to gloss over in his representation. This in turn marks Saint-Loup out as a manipulator of the verifiable historical record, through selective representation of the war years, attempting to present the SS Charlemagne Division in an heroic light. For example, his representation of Jean de Mayol de Lupé as the monarchist pastor matches closely the real Mayol de Lupé's own view of the war in the East as

[594] George Mosse, 'Two World Wars and the Myth of War Experience', *Journal of Contemporary History* 21 (4), p. 499.
[595] Carrard, *The French Who Fought for Hitler*, p. 93.
[596] For example, the first footnote contained within *Les Hérétiques* explains a reference to the emigration to Prussia of French Protestants following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 (Saint-Loup *LH*, p. 18). Maps are used throughout to illustrate military situations (for example, see 'Combats de la Visloka', p. 69).

an heroic Christian crusade, rather than a brutal and barbaric clash.[597] As a professional writer, Saint-Loup is moreover able to take real events and represent them in fictive form, which allows his work a persuasive quality and licence with reality. This sets his representation of the past apart from other veterans, such as Christian de la Mazière, who wrote autobiographies about the period, but were forced to gain acceptance by negating or rejecting their past.[598] Finally, as has also been pointed out, Saint-Loup (like Sajer) sold well, and was published by well-known publishing houses.[599] Not only does this point to a market for his work, but also suggests his view of that past gained some currency, influencing the views of far-right politicians such as Pierre Vial, a founding member of the Amis de Saint-Loup, created to honour the life and work of author.[600]

Within *Les Hérétiques*, whilst the combatants' doomed struggle is portrayed as heroic, it is also used to portray the members of the Charlemagne Division as victims of the war, and in particular the Soviets, depicted as 'les Cavaliers de l'Apocalypse', bent on the destruction of European civilisation.[601] Once again, however, Saint-Loup's vision of the past is tainted by the author's ability to portray only a selective representation of the past. Despite the attempt to portray the combatants (and himself) as victims of situation, once again Saint-Loup does not present a complete picture. This is because in spite of his attempts, Saint-Loup is incapable of writing as a victim. During the war, he himself was never the object of the excesses of the SS as countless millions were. Despite fighting on the Eastern Front, which Norman Davies has argued was the most barbaric of the European

[597] Pierre Giolitto, *Volontaires Français sou l'uniforme Allemand* (Paris: Perrin, 1999), p.61.
[598] Mazière, *Le Rêveur casqué.* For further information on de la Mazière, see Maurice Bonnett, *Christian de la Mazière: La dernière chevauchée du Cavalier Soleil* (Paris: Dualpha, 2011).
[599] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 20.
[600] See http://www.resistances.be/vial.html (accessed 21 February 2013).
[601] Saint-Loup, *LH*, p. 168, p. 202.

theatre, with both sides matched in brutality, Saint-Loup was relatively lucky, attached to the LVF and SS, Charlemagne Division, and avoiding some of the worst excesses of the war.[602] Moreover, he also escaped punishment for collaboration at the end of the war, by fleeing to Argentina,[603] and evading the imprisonment and execution that faced many of his comrades.[604]

As Saint-Loup's characters have not suffered in the (often extremely brutal) way that actual victims of the Nazis had (as can be said of the main characters in the novels of Tournier and Modiano), it makes their acceptance of the Nazis' policies and ideals more readily acceptable. Thus, in a continuing theme throughout the novel, many of those within *Les Hérétiques* view France as part of a 'greater Reich' which had as its prime aims the defeat of Bolshevism and international Jewry. Although, to most readers, this 'new Europe' would equate to subjection to Germany and National Socialism, for French members of the SS this was not the case. Thus, they are fighting for 'Europe' against Bolshevism, rather than for France or for Germany as nation states. As James G. Shields has noted, this 'rested on particular conceptions of national, racial and cultural identity, mediated through the historically-resonant notion of an East/West clash of civilisation', which in turn was part of Vichy's radical reshaping of transnational enmities and alliances.[605] That Vichy could perform such a radical reshaping was due to Germany's war on Communism providing a new rationale, with a clear ideological enemy in the Soviet Union. This allowed first the LVF and then the *Charlemagne* Division to

[602] Norman Davies, *Europe at War 1939-1945: No Simple Victory* (London: Macmillan, 2006), p.24, p. 488.
[603] Moreau, *Sous le signe*, pp.189-194.
[604] Jonathan Trigg *Hitler's Gauls: The History of the 33rd Waffen-SS Division Charlemagne* (Stroud: Spellmount, 2009), pp. 159-167.
[605] Shields 'Charlemagne's Crusaders', p. 84.

provide a military outlet to unite anti-communists.[606] Beyond such virulent anti-Communism, this 'Crusade in the East' also provided a way to overcome the defeat of 1940, and to make the French equal to the Germans.[607] Such anti-Communism and sympathy for Germany's war aims can be seen throughout *Les Hérétiques*. Moreover, in realistic terms such enthusiasm for the destruction of Communism did not necessarily equate to success. Whilst the remains of the Charlemagne division fought desperate battles to hold back the Soviets at the end of the war, the LVF was withdrawn from front line duty due to its lamentable performance in 1941.[608]

Saint-Loup is not, however, a fantasist in his representation of military collaboration. He does not attempt to show all those he portrays as on the 'good' side, but does show that volunteers, in varying degree, illustrate they are deserving of rehabilitation.[609] Whereas *Les Hérétiques* has noteworthy gaps in historical coverage, in arguing for rehabilitation, Saint-Loup can be seen as more successful as an author. By humanising and individualising his subject, he is effective at least in raising questions about how individuals should be judged. In part this is due to his matter-of-fact style of writing, which does not play games with the reader, and in this sense Saint-Loup is like Sajer. Presentation gives them a 'realistic' approach, even if, as Lloyd points out, their 'adventures are skilfully limited to the immediate heroism of combat against overwhelming odds and their ethics are limited to loyalty to comrades'.[610] However, not all writers who portrayed military and paramilitary collaboration employ such a conventional narrative approach, as the examples of Tournier and Modiano illustrate. Nonetheless, the same fundamental

[606] Shields 'Charlemagne's Crusaders', p. 94.
[607] Gordon, *Collaborationism in France*, p. 257.
[608] Albert Merglen, 'Soldats Français sous uniformes allemands 1941-1945 : LVF et « Waffen-SS » Français' *Revue d'histoire de la deuxième guerre mondiale* 108 (1977), p. 74.
[609] Carrard, *The French who Fought for Hitler*, p. 22.
[610] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 5.

questions can be asked of these works: why did those who become involved in these forms of collaboration do so, and what form did their involvement take? These same questions give different answers, and illustrate differences and similarities, than when posed of Saint-Loup's novel.

Military and Paramilitary Collaboration as By-products of Fate

Some combatants, like Saint-Loup's characters (and the author himself) can, as discussed above, be described as 'political' soldiers, with a clear ideological viewpoint. However, as Tournier and Modiano show, the novels give the impression that by taking part in military and paramilitary collaboration the protagonists are choosing to live a life apart from that of the defeated and downtrodden population as a whole, though this manifests itself in different ways. As pointed out, the characters in *Les Hérétiques* certainly see themselves as leaving behind nationhood and belonging instead with the Germans to a new order, and this is done in an enthusiastic and elitist manner,[611] which contrasts with *La Ronde de Nuit*.[612] Through the narrator in *La Ronde de Nuit*, we see instead the attachment of Swing Troubadour, through whose eyes the novel is recounted, to the (temporary) 'winners'. This, however, is done almost without thought, with seemingly very little concern by the narrator for either his body or soul, and very little attachment to the material benefits that such a situation could bring. The involvement is instead

[611] This can be seen as a theme throughout Saint-Loup's work. As Saint-Loup notes in the first volume of his trilogy, *Les Volontaires*, those Frenchmen who join the German armed forces, and in particular the Waffen SS, belong to an elite: they are 'hommes qui font éclater les cadres moraux ou spirituels de leur temps', for 'ils représentent, en effet, l'élément dynamique de l'évolution et entraînent derrière eux, à plus ou moins longue échéance, les masses végétatives'. Saint-Loup, *Les Volontaires* (Paris, Presses de la Cité, 1963), p. 7.

[612] For *Les Boulevards de ceinture* see chapter six.

brought about by the connivance of the plain-clothes police unit to which he has become attached. Where Saint-Loup relates his characters to broad themes, such as anti-Bolshevism, which avoids in-depth examination of the issues involved, Modiano, in contrast, reduces the complexities of war to ambivalent personalities.[613] These varying representations of motivation for involvement, through ideological belief and non-deliberate involvement brought about by a lack of self-preservation bordering on the fatalistic (and there is a strong hint of illogical confusion within the narrator's comments within *La Ronde de Nuit*)[614] can be contrasted with the behaviour of Abel Tiffauges in *Le Roi des Aulnes*. Whilst not ideologically motivated or freely drifting, Tiffauges uses the opportunities presented to him through his work on Göring's estate and at the *SS* training school to enjoy the things in life which bring him pleasure, such as his love of animals, and his more dubious interest in children.

Despite differing motivations, all the novels show those involved in military and paramilitary collaboration making the best of the situations they find themselves in. Even Modiano's Swing Troubadour, who is made by and follows events, and who is too weak to reject the company he has found himself in,[615] illustrates through his descriptions the moral turpitude of such company. His account of the dubious guests at a party given by his collaborating police commander, for example, details an assortment of individuals, including convicts, gigolos, male prostitutes, and brothel runners. Through this, Modiano creates a scene which comments on the specific circumstances of the war which allow such a criminal gang, operating with

[613] Hamel, *Bataille des mémoires*, p. 212.
[614] Dervilla Cooke, *Present Pasts: Patrick Modiano's (Auto)Biographical Fictions* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), p. 44.
[615] Alan Morris, *Patrick Modiano* (Oxford: Berg, 1996), p. 25.

the French Gestapo, to exist. The narrator recognises the party he is attending contains only those who could flourish in such a period: 'Ils avaient brusquement surgi du black-out, d'une période de désespoir et de misère, par un phénomène analogue à celui de la generation spontanée'.[616] Clearly, the collaborating narrator dislikes these people for what they are, but seems unable to distance himself from their world, providing a believable rendering of the real life *bande de la rue Lauriston* on which Modiano bases his novel.[617]

Some awareness of contemporary events is again seen in *Le Roi des Aulnes*, for just as the narrator in *La Ronde de Nuit* dislikes his dubious company, so too for Tiffauges: 'certes le SS lui inspirait la plus vive répulsion'.[618] However, just as in the case of Swing Troubadour, so too must Tiffauges accept the situations he finds himself in, and submit to forces over which he has no power.[619] This acceptance by the lead characters of many unpleasant aspects of life found in *Le Roi des Aulnes* and *La Ronde de Nuit* (and by the pursuance of the soldiers' cause until the final defeat of 1945 in *Les Hérétiques*), also further points to an involvement in military and paramilitary collaboration engendered by situations in which the protagonists have, or feel they have, nothing to lose by becoming involved with collaboration. Tiffauges can be seen as the most extreme example of this phenomenon, rejecting not only society's values, but also history itself, through his creation of a 'new history' for himself.[620] In all these novels, those involved can be seen as somewhat lonely individuals, and most generously described as social misfits. Such a representation once again matches the historical record, with many members of the

[616] Modiano, *RdN*, p. 129-130.
[617] Morris, *Patrick Modiano*, p. 40.
[618] Tournier, *RdA*, pp. 392-93.
[619] Davis, *Michel Tournier*, p. 44.
[620] David Gascoigne, *Michel Tournier* (Oxford: Berg, 1996), p.188.

Milice suspected of mental instability.[621] Modiano's narrator comes from an orphan background, and this may in part be a cause of his later mental problems and detachment from the world around him. It seems a likely explanation that his two mute companions, Coco Lacour and Esmeralda, are simply figments of his imagination designed to compensate for his absent parents.[622] Tournier's Tiffauges is perhaps more unquestionably strange, with an interest in children strongly suggested to include paedophilia, even if Tournier himself attempts to claim his characters' strikingly conventional obsessions are of 'la portée humaine et universelle'.[623]

All the novels therefore give the impression that the main characters they portray do not have the option of a quiet existence during the Occupation, and of avoiding involvement in the tumultuous events that are occurring around them. This is not to state that those involved had a purposeful aim or plan which guided their actions, as the narrator in *La Ronde de Nuit* demonstrates. However, despite some lack of intention shown by some characters, it would seem that fate leads many such individuals in the novels into the situations described. As stated, *La Ronde de Nuit* is a strong example of the issue of fate, which is repeatedly referred to. The narrator suggests that, as 'j'ai promis tant de choses que je n'ai pas tenues, fixé tant de rendez-vous auxquels je ne suis pas allé, qu'il me semblait « enfantin » de devenir un traître exemplaire'.[624] This in itself suggests that to join the collaborating police was an action in-built to his nature; the reference to 'child's play' surreptitiously suggesting this has been predestined since his earliest years. This point is developed

[621] André Laurens, *Une police politique sous l'occupation: La Milice français en Ariège, 1942-1944* (Foix: Broché, 1982), pp. 128-131.
[622] Morris, *Patrick Modiano*, p. 24.
[623] Walter Redfern, *Michel Tournier: Le Coq de bruyère* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1996), p. 106.
[624] Modiano, *RdN*, p. 24.

later in the novel, when the narrator reflects on life that 'on n'y coupe pas. Elle finit par vous envoyer ses sergents recruteurs': in this case, the collaborating police.[625] Once in such a situation it seems clear to him that fate has taken over his existence and that nothing can now be done, even though this means his days are numbered and he will eventually pay for his crimes.[626] This nihilistic approach is reinforced by his lack of concern for both his and humanity's fate, and sadly indicative of the results the lack of thought that many ill-informed young people gave to joining up could have.[627]

Swing Troubadour's passively destructive attitude contrasts with that displayed within *Les Hérétiques*, where appreciation of the cause of anti-Bolshevism remains throughout, in turn allowing protagonists to greet their fate in at least a semi-positive light. However, both examples pale in comparison with the joy with which Tiffauges greets his fate and the opportunities his collaboration allows him. For Tiffauges, Germany presents a blank canvas on which he can imprint himself, and his destiny.[628] That he wishes to greet his fate in such a manner can be seen by an examination of his past. In Tiffauges' native town, he would be regarded as a child-molester (his neighbours were suspicious of him even before his assault on a girl in an early section of the novel), but in Germany he has the opportunity to be freed from this past and embark on a new career working for Göring, and later, the SS training School. Although Tiffauges' crime(s) indicate he is a more severe offender, his experiences mark him out as one of the social outcasts who sought a new life

[625] Modiano, *RdN*, p. 93.
[626] Morris, Patrick Modiano, p. 27.
[627] Antoine Plaît, 'Les jeunes Français volontaires sous l'uniforme allemand (1941-1945) in Jean-William Dereymez (ed.) Être jeune en France (1939-1945) (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001), pp. 119-127.
[628] Margaret Sankey, 'L'exemple du « Roi des Aulnes » in *Images et signes de Michel Tournier: Actes du colloque du Centre culturel International de Cerisy-la-Salle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991), p. 335.

outside of France, alongside the many unemployed and those escaping failed marriages.[629] This view of Tiffauges as a refugee from his past should, however, be tempered by his enjoyment of the life journey he is on, reflective of his adventurous nature.

More hedonistic motivations naturally played a part, most obviously seen in *La Ronde de Nuit*, where the extremely comfortable wartime lifestyle of the collaborating police group, as opposed to the majority of the population, is clearly shown early on by Modiano, during an evening in his characters' commandeered flat:

> Zieff suce une aile de poulet. Ça fait plaisir de bouffer par ces temps de restriction. Savez-vous ce que j'ai fait tout à l'heure? Je me suis mis devant une glace et j'ai barbouillé mon visage de foie gras ! Du foie gras à 15 000 francs le médaillon ! (Il pousse de grands éclats de rire.) Encore un peu de cognac? Propose Pols de Helder. On n'en trouve plus. Il vaut 100 000 francs le quart de litre. Cigarettes anglaises? Elles me viennent directement de Lisbonne. 20 000 francs le paquet.[630]

This scene is indicative of a collaborating police enjoying the fruits of their work with the occupying forces to the full. Direct reference is made to the rationing most of France was subject to, contrasting the gastronomic delights they are enjoying, illustrated by the consumption of pâté de foie gras in front of a mirror, which Zieff does to both enhance his pleasure, knowing the diet most people exist on, and to boast that he can be wasteful with such a valued commodity. It is therefore not just their sensory pleasure being flaunted, for their (undoubtedly ill-gotten) wealth is also shown, and the cost of the items they consume not only reflects this, but also illustrates how sought-after the items that they are devouring are. The ability to behave with such impunity is indicative of the wider licence that the Khédive (one

[629] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, p. 440.
[630] Modiano, *RdN*, pp. 28-29.

of the leaders of the gang, modelled on Henri Lafont) is allowed in far more serious criminal matters - such as the torture of resistance members - later in the novel.[631] This shows the clear material benefits of paramilitary collaboration, and mirrors the luxurious parties thrown by the real life Bonny-Lafont gang.[632]

Although this scene is a component of what is unsurprisingly a somewhat depraved party, during this revelry, the leader of the police group, the Khédive, introduces what is to be a common theme of his character, namely his desire to be a Police Commissioner. In this the Khédive is echoing the real life Bonny (and on whom M. Philibert was modelled), who was once a successful peacetime policeman, but whose professional life stalled, collaboration giving him the chance to re-start his career.[633] Importantly, this claim allows the Khédive to gain the respect he feels he deserves. This link between power, and perception of respect due to power, is one common in narratives of military and paramilitary collaboration. Just as the Khédive seeks to block out the past and gain this respect, so does Tiffauges, taking an official role at the SS school, far away from memories of sexual assault. By becoming the 'roi des aulnes', Tiffauges is allowed a form of dignity, for although an outsider, his position allows him power and influence.[634] What, however, is clear to the reader, is that the response of many of the other characters in the novels is based not on respect, but fear - although this does allow the characters in positions of power to feel a certain amount of self-respect within themselves. The example of the Khédive shows professional advancement leading to a position where inflicting revenge is permissible. There is, however, a line between self-interest, which is by

[631] Baptiste Roux, *Figures de l'occupation dans l'oeuvre de Patrick Modiano* (Paris: Harmattan, 1999), p. 72.
[632] Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, p. 191.
[633] Ory, *Les collaborateurs*, p. 262.
[634] Rachel Edwards, *Myth and the Fiction of Michel Tournier and Patrick Grainville* (Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 1999), p. 172.

extension 'salvation', and 'primal' self-interest. Characters such as the Khédive take pleasure in their roles, although there are differing forms of pleasure within this. Such 'primal' self-interest, which Modiano illustrates, would explain the success of recruitment campaigns for the French Gestapo.[635]

However, whilst Modiano's narrator and Tiffauges have little control over their fate, and both participate in military or paramilitary collaboration, their reactions are ultimately different in the pleasure they take from their tasks. The narrator in *La Ronde de Nuit* cares little for the tasks he has to carry out, and such is the ambivalence of Swing Troubadour's involvement in paramilitary collaboration, it is difficult to pin the character's position down – is he 'salaud, or martyr'?[636] Through this, Modiano suggests such compromise is natural.[637] This contrasts with Tiffauges, who mirrors the collaborators in *Les Hérétiques* in the willingness with which he greets his new tasks. Indeed, in both cases, collaboration is not only willing, but the activities carried out are self-motivated. Tiffagues chooses to become the 'ogre' of his story, travelling far and wide gathering children for the SS training school, at which he carries out his pseudo-eugenic research. These cases illustrated that whilst some military and paramilitary collaboration was willing, this was not necessarily always the case.

Nevertheless, where this collaboration was willing, it would seem that the novels demonstrate some form of attraction to Nazi Germany, albeit idiosyncratic. As discussed, there was undoubted appeal to the concept of a new Europe, in which those involved in collaboration believed France would play a role as a partner to

[635] Maurice Rajsfus, *La Police de Vichy. Les forces de l'ordre françaises au service de la Gestapo. 1940-1944* (Paris: Le Cherche-midi Editeur, 1995), p. 51.
[636] Morris, *Patrick Modiano*, pp. 22-23.
[637] Hamel, *Bataille des mémoires*, p. 286.

Germany in the struggle against the common enemy, Bolshevism. Yet anti-Bolshevism was not the only attraction to Germany, as Tournier's Tiffauges illustrates with the delight he takes in the charm of the German countryside, providing a mirror for the cultural and social life of the country, and explains to the reader why he prefers Germany to his native France:

> C'est ainsi que lui fut donnée la réponse à la question qu'il se posait depuis son passage du Rhin. Il savait maintenant ce qu'il était venu chercher si loin vers le nord-est : *sous la lumière hyperboréenne froide et pénétrante tous les symboles brillaient d'un éclat inégalé*. A l'opposé de la France, terre océanique, noyée de brumes, et aux lignes gommées par d'infinis dégradés, l'Allemagne continentale, plus dure et plus rudimentaire, était le pays du dessin appuyé, simplifié, stylisé, facilement lu et retenu.[638]

However, this attraction for Germany is not wholehearted or unquestioning, for although: 'la mauvaise pente française menait à la misère des teintes passées, des corps invertébrés, des relâchements douteux – à la promiscuité, à la lâcheté - l'Allemagne était toujours menacée de devenir un théâtre de grimaces et de caricatures, comme le montrait son armée, bel échantillonnage de têtes de jeu de massacre, depuis le Feldwebel au front de bœuf jusqu'à l'officier monoclé et corseté'.[639]

This, however, is overridden by his love for the land of Germany and its animals, which can be seen as visceral.[640] In this he is educated by Göring, a relationship in which Tiffauges sees himself as both servant and pupil due to the Reichsmarschall's perceived expertise as both 'phallophore' and 'coprologique'.[641] In a similar manner, he later learns 'medical' knowledge from the SS doctor

[638] Tournier, *RdA*, p 280.
[639] *Ibid*., p. 281.
[640] Gascoigne, *Tournier*, p. 185.
[641] *RdA*, pp. 331 – 332.

Blättchenat at Kaltenborn Castle. Yet, in this case, he supplants his teacher, leading to his ultimate role as the 'ogre' of the story. This role ties in with the mythical elements of the novel, clearly laid out from the opening paragraphs: 'Un Ogre? C'est-à-dire un monster féerique, émergeant de la nuit des temps? Je crois, oui, à ma nature féerique, je veux dire à cette connivance secrète qui mêle en profondeur mon aventure personnelle au cours des choses, et lui permet de l'incliner dans son sens. Je crois aussi que je suis issu de la nuit des temps'.[642]

It can also be seen that this role is representative of the conscription of the period, which imposed itself more and more heavily on German society as the Nazis' military situation grew ever worse. Tiffauges represents the worst excesses of this conscription, scouring the countryside to take boys from their families before they have even reached their teenage years. Many were ultimately to die defending Kaltenborn Castle from the Russians. This determined yet desperate fight can be seen as representing the destiny of the Hitler Youth in Berlin in 1945. Whilst the Volkssturm was drafting 12-year-old Hitler Youth members into its ranks, the children under Tiffauges' care take delivery of an anti-aircraft battery they are to fight with. During the final fight for Berlin, the Hitler Youth formed a major part of the last line of German defence alongside elements of the Charlemagne Division, and were reportedly among the fiercest fighters, mirrored by the desperate actions of the boys contained within Kaltenborn.

There is a heavy element of romanticism within Tiffauges and in his attraction to the aesthetic of Nazism, and the barbarity this involves.[643] Tiffauges' interest goes

[642] Tournier, *RdA*, p. 13.
[643] Arlette Bouloumié, *Michel Tournier: le roman mythologique suivi de questions a Michel Tournier*, (Paris: José Corti, 1988), p. 104.

beyond this however, and it can be seen that he is in search of involvement in a mythological world, such mythology becoming a more prominent part of the narrative as the novel develops, although it also becomes more ironic to counter-balance this.[644] As part of this process Tiffauges believes that he is outside of time, and belongs to a different race of beings.[645] Whilst it would be fanciful to compare such an extreme attitude to the majority of those who engaged in military and paramilitary collaboration, such romanticism certainly played some part in the appeal. Members of military groups can be seen as 'romantic volunteers' in a 'quest of camaraderie and adventure in rural byways', and who liked this 'camaraderie' and 'spirit of outdoor life'.[646] Again, this is clearly present within Saint-Loup's work, and at least partly represented by Tournier. Tournier and Saint-Loup also raise the question as to whether the quest in the East is neo-pagan or Christian. Saint-Loup's writing can be seen to stem from a Christian heritage, whereas Tournier displays strong elements of neo-paganism.[647]

Interestingly, this mythic neo-paganism also affects Tournier's representation of the past, as within the work it can be seen that verifiable history is annexed by myth, with two timescales represented. One can be seen as 'normal' and progressive; the other, mythical and regressive.[648] Whilst Tournier's mythological devices cannot be claimed to represent the experience of ordinary French soldiers on the Eastern Front, it does have some basis in Nazi ideology, bringing to mind the links between

[644] Cloonan, *The Writing of War*, p. 142.
[645] Gascoigne, *Tournier,* p. 187.
[646] Gordon, *Collaborationism in France*, pp. 255-256.
[647] *Ibid*., p. 258.
[648] Gascoigne, *Tournier*, pp. 189-190.

the movement and occultism.[649] However, Saint Loup avoids exploring this in too great a depth, or answering difficult questions. In this, Tiffauges and Swing Troubadour are different from Saint Loup's characters. His narratives are matter-of-fact, and do not play with the reader.[650] This can be explained in part by his novels' aim to be 'histories', but this approach also allows him to avoid examination of individuals in-depth, and any difficult questions which may be part of this.

However, as the novels show, such in-depth exploration of personal motives is not always necessary. In reality, the collaborators of *La Ronde de Nuit* are nothing more than criminal thugs, hired to do the dirty work of others. This concept of carrying out the work of others, namely the Germans, is constantly present in works on military and paramilitary collaboration. This in turn raises the issue of whether those who collaborated inside metropolitan France are treated to different representations than those who did so abroad; it would certainly seem Saint-Loup's narratives present military collaboration in a far more positive light compared with narratives of military and paramilitary collaboration set within France. This is not to claim that novels offered a pro-collaboration stance in any way, but that the adventure present in those novels set outside of France helps to offset the morally dubious nature of the characters portrayed. Whilst the characters of *La Ronde de Nuit* have no redeeming features whatsoever, simply willing to serve for sadistic pleasure and personal gain, those of *Les Hérétiques* can at least be seen as fighting for their beliefs (however misguided). Similarly, despite the strongly-suggested paedophilia of Tiffauges, his character is portrayed as an animal-lover which,

[649] For a discussion of the relationship between Nazism and occultism, see Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism: Secret Aryan Cults and Their Influence on Nazi Ideology* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co, 2003).
[650] Carrard, *The French Who Fought for Hitler*, p. 96.

combined with his rescue of a Jewish child at the end of the novel, allows a more complex character to emerge than that of the amoral narrator of *La Ronde de Nuit* and the boorish characters that surround him. In this sense, Modiano's work can be seen as a critique of works which use the war as a moral or political exemplar.[651] Rather than become engaged in attempting to provide judgement on the past he gives representation to, as an author, Modiano instead chooses that *La Ronde de Nuit* avoid this form of engagement, giving the firm impression that any such efforts would be futile.

It is possible that this nuanced characterisation of military and paramilitary collaboration is attributable to, and a comment on, the *guerre franco-française*.[652] In general, if an individual were involved in military or paramilitary collaboration, it was regarded as being more acceptable to be French and in league with the German occupiers working against another country outside of France, than be French and working with the Germans against the French. Interestingly, it is France's former combatants who originate attempts to re-habilitate the SS, beginning with Saint-Loup.[653] Although all collaboration assisted the Germans, that carried out abroad could at least be presented as not directly against French interests. These issues in themselves divided military from paramilitary collaboration, for military collaboration (such as participation in the LVF) was carried out abroad, whereas paramilitary collaboration (the most notorious being Darnand's Service d'Ordre Légionnaire which later became the Milice) carried out

[651] Hamel, *Bataille des mémoires*, p. 232.
[652] For further information see Tzvetan Todorov, *Une Tragédie française : Eté 44, scènes de guerre civile* (Paris: Seuil, 2004). This provides a useful, local study of St. Amant Montrond in Normandy, which examines a conflict which is often underplayed by historians.
[653] Mosse, 'Two World Wars and the Myth of War Experience', pp. 499.

actions against these groups' fellow countrymen, which can influence the readers' reaction to the narratives.

Leaving this distinction behind, it is possible to question whether those engaged in paramilitary and military collaboration were seen, or saw themselves, in the role of conquered or conqueror within the novels, as they often felt rejected by their own communities.[654] This question is most clearly raised by Tournier's Tiffauges, billeted at the home of a native German family during his attendance at a hunt as a servant of Göring: 'On les avait munis de billets de logement chez les habitants ayant des écuries pour les chevaux. Tiffauges, habillé et chaussé de neuf, goûta la circonstance qui lui faisait réquisitionner une chambre chez le civil, comme en pays conquis. L'Allemand était-il toujours vainqueur, le Français était-il encore prisonnier?'.[655]

Tiffauges, taken prisoner in 1940 during France's shattering defeat, clearly finds himself in a situation where he is fulfilling a role similar to that of many of the German soldiers now occupying France, although Tiffauges has the added distinction of being linked in his militaristic activities to Göring. This link to the Reichsmarschall is noted at his arrival at Kaltenborn, and although this particular aspect of Tiffauges' adventure in no way resembles the normal experience of military collaboration, it does highlight the issues involved, as he fulfils the dual role of a defeated 'occupier'.

This dual state could be seen in members of organisations such as the LVF. Participants wore a tricolour badge on their German uniforms, and fought under a

[654] Burrin, *La France à l'heure allemande*, pp. 440-441.
[655] Tournier, *RdA*, p. 355.

French flag.[656] Such confirmed expressions of patriotism once again illustrate the right-wing nature of such groups. One of the most famous former combatants to side with the Germans was Christian de la Mazière, interviewed in Marcel Ophüls' *Le Chagrin et la pitié*.[657] A surviving volunteer of the SS Charlemagne Division, when interviewed and asked why he decided to join, he replied that he was raised in a rightist family before the war, and read right-wing dailies full of alarming news about Communist atrocities in the Soviet Union and Spain. This, combined with the racial intolerance prevalent at the time, provided his motivation. Although his explanations for involvement match the typology of those who became involved, la Mazière candidly admitted regret for his wartime activities and acknowledged the deficiencies of the cause for which he had fought. In this instance, this repentant performance, chosen by Ophüls, fulfilled a similar purpose to Saint-Loup's; namely, to explain and negate the past. As noted, la Mazière was displayed as a 'youngish middle-aged penitent, languorous of manner and attractive in a classically-Gallic way', who had a 'nervous articulateness, touches of arrogance, and look of someone haunted'.[658] With this, *Le Chagrin et la pitié* can be seen to 'load the dice' to influence the viewer by presenting an attractive and plausible character, which would have been far more difficult with an individual such as the less engaging, unrepentant, and 'haughty and self-righteous' Saint-Loup.[659]

Whilst the real-life de la Mazière, unlike Saint-Loup, may have professed regret for what he had taken part in, shame for the activities of collaborators is present within *Le Roi des Aulnes*, and to some degree in *La Ronde de Nuit*, which can be seen to

[656] Vinen, *The Unfree French*, p. 96.
[657] Marcel Ophüls (dir.), *Le Chagrin et la pitié* (1969).
[658] Samuel Hux, '*The Captive Dreamer* by Christian de la Mazière', *Worldview* 18 (1975), pp. 52-54.
[659] Carrard, *The French Who Fought for Hitler*, p. 210.

denigrate both the resistance and collaboration.[660] Tiffauges's first feeling of guilt comes at a time when he encounters a column of French prisoners of war fleeing from the advancing Russians: 'Dès leur survenue, Tiffauges sut à quoi s'en tenir, mais la première phrase en français qu'il entendit ne le blessa pas moins comme une écharde. Il ouvrit la bouche pour les saluer, les interroger, mais une oppression qui ressemblait à de la honte lui nouait la gorge'.[661]

Yet at this first meeting with his fellow countrymen, Tiffauges still does not feel French. This is not just because he has lived the latter part of the war as a German; as the reference to his jackboots also illustrates, his position of predatory dominance is something that sets him apart.[662] During the pre-war period, Tiffauges too felt a division from his own countrymen, which can again be seen as a characteristic of the collaborator. As the French prisoners of war march by:

> Les prisonniers défilaient devant lui maintenant, et ils baissaient la voix, le prenant pour un Allemand, sauf un petit noiraud qui ressemblait à Phiphi, et qui lui lança au passage :
>
> - Fritz kaput! Sovietski partout, überall!
>
> Cette gouaille parisienne surgissant déjà dans ce fugitif contact avec les siens rappela soudain à Tiffauges la distance infranchissable qui l'avait toujours séparé – lourd, taciturne et mélancolique – du gentil peuple de ses camarades.[663]

In light of the readily apparent differences which Tiffauges sees as marking himself out from the French, such prisoners are soon forgotten by him, mirroring the attitude of many in France towards the soldiers who were seen, through their weakness, to have lost the war in 1940.[664] However, he returns to this theme when

---

[660] Denise Cima, *Patrick Modiano: La Ronde de nuit* (Paris: Ellipses, 2000), p. 54-63.
[661] Tournier, *RdA*, p. 530.
[662] Gascoigne, *Tournier*, p. 52.
[663] Tournier, *RdA*, p. 531.
[664] Sarah Fishman, *We Will Wait: Wives of French Prisoners of War, 1940-1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), p. 154.

the Russians are about to assault the Castle at Kaltenborn, for it is at this point that he again puts on his French uniform. Cynically, this could be seen as an attempt to change his identity to save his life, which represents the attempts by many who fought for the Germans to escape their fate at the end of the war by disguising their identities.[665] It might be more pertinent to assume that the combination of his sighting of the French prisoners of war, his desire to save the Jewish boy he had previously rescued and the fact that the German world he took part in is now being destroyed, combined to make this an obvious choice for him at this point.

Whilst any feelings of shame Tiffauges feels become apparent in *Le Roi des Aulnes* at a late stage, shame is present as a theme throughout *La Ronde de Nuit*, partly due to the nature of Modiano's writing, which leaves the reader to speculate on characters' pasts – and, indeed, their presents.[666] This is displayed firstly through the writing style of Modiano, whose descriptive powers show the world of the collaborating policemen to be murky and disgraceful, leaving the reader in no doubt that it would be shameful to be part of such a world. Secondly, it is present in the character of the narrator. As above, the narrator is fundamentally amoral; he carries out his activities simply because he believes it a fate he cannot change. However, what makes this obedience to his perceived fate worse is that he has some concept of what the moral results of his actions are (even if not in a strong sense), but abdicates responsibility through weakness of character.[667] This can be seen in a dream sequence where the narrator visualises the faces of a resistance group he has informed on, and who are about to be arrested:

---

[665] For numerous examples, see Robert Forbes, *For Europe: The French Volunteers of the Waffen-SS* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2006), pp. 494-505.
[666] William VanderWolk *Rewriting the Past: Memory, History and Narration in the Novels of Patrick Modiano* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), p.11.
[667] Morris, *Modiano*, p. 25.

> On dirait qu'ils vous demandent des comptes. Pendant quelques minutes, on ne regrette pas du tout d'avoir donné les adresses. Face à ces héros, qui vous scrutent de leur regard clair, on serait meme tenté de crier bien haut sa qualité de mouchard. Mais peu à peu le vernis de leur visage s'écaille, ils perdent de leur arrogance et la belle certitude qui les illuminait s'éteint comme une bougie que l'on soufflé. Une larme glisse sur la joue de l'un d'eux. Un autre penche la tête et vous lance un regard triste. Un autre vous fixe avec stupeur, comme s'il ne s'attendait pas à ça de votre part…[668]

This dream sequence seems to express initial guilt, but as the members of the resistance appear to weaken, this disappears, indicating the narrator thrives on power over others and that this ultimately overrides any moral compunction he may have, going some way to explaining why he continues to cooperate with the paramilitary group he is part of. These dream thoughts reflect his own opinions, for when he reveals the resistance group, his conscious thoughts mirror those present in his dreams: 'Pour la première fois de ma vie, j'ai éprouvé ce qu'on appelle un cas de conscience. Très passager d'ailleurs. Ils me versèrent cent mille francs d'acompte sur les renseignements que je leur fournirais'.[669]

Conclusion

In some ways, this moral bankruptcy should not be ascribed to all military and paramilitary collaborators, and some of their actions can be attributed to a wish to remove the shame of 1940; to become the conquerors, rather than the conquered, and to answer the questions about French manliness and masculinity which were clearly present in collaborationist circles.[670] This wish to join the 'winning' side of 1940 is clear, although the novels also show the irony of this position, as the victors of 1940 turn out to be the ultimate losers of 1944 and 1945; although as *Les*

[668] Modiano, *RdN*, pp. 52-53.
[669] *Ibid.,* p. 107.
[670] Joan Tumblety, 'Revenge of the fascist knights: masculine identities in *Je suis partout,* 1940-1944'**,** *Modern & Contemporary France* 7 (1999), p.18.

Hérétiques' anti-Communism suggests, even then, the world situation, in which anti-Communists could find common ground with Gaullists (even if those like Saint-Loup were from the more extreme right), could be interpreted as a continuing struggle against Communism.[671]

Given that such common ground could be found in the aftermath of the war, whilst this chapter has examined both military and paramilitary collaboration it is worth discussing how far similarities between paramilitary (and broadly military) collaboration and paramilitary resistance can be discovered. Before examining the issue, it is worth pointing out contrasting points. It is certainly the case that those who participated in the resistance did not have an attraction to Germany in the way that some characters in these novels did. Indeed, the far-right politics of Nazi Germany would have been anathema to most of the resistance, and those fighting in the resistance were undoubtedly supporting the enemies of a loathsome regime. Having stated these important distinctions, it is worth noting that a number of comparisons can be made.

As has been noted, the narrator of *La Ronde de Nuit* makes an important point when he highlights the underground nature of the resistance, which shares much with his own experience as a member of the paramilitary collaborating police (although it should be stated that many elements of military and paramilitary collaboration, such as the Milice and LVF, could not be regarded as underground, it should also be noted that, post-war, their activity was heavily down-played). Similarly, the intentions of those who joined the resistance can be compared. Issues of deliberate or non-deliberate intentions are present in resistance narratives, as they are within

[671] Robert Gildea, *France Since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 68.

historical record,[672] and many careers depended on the issue of fate present in the novels examined here. This could rest on the personality of the individual concerned, and to suggest that no one who resisted had a predisposition for violence, was unappealing, or could be classed as a loner, would be erroneous. Linked to this is the political viewpoint of those who resisted. Whilst the far-right was clearly attractive to collaboration, there were strong anti-communist elements present in some sections of the resistance, and this anti-communism fed easily into the era of the Cold War when the normal balance between the Left and Right was restored.[673] Comparison too can be made between some of those who resisted and some of those who collaborated in their desire to use paramilitary and military activity to remove the stain of France's defeat; in this sense, those who fought for the Germans can be compared to the Free French.[674] These similarities, in novels written during de Gaulle's presidency, question his view of the past. Moreover, they challenge the perceived notion of an overriding repression of memories of collaboration.

Finally, although the extremely disagreeable nature of the characters involved in collaboration in these novels is obvious, the point should be made explicitly, for it is a key trait of the individuals within the novels. In essence, they can be seen as unappealing loners, and many could certainly be described as having mental health problems. Tiffauges inhabits a world described with devices which clearly bring elements of mythical stories to mind (such as his role as an 'ogre') and which, in turn, can be seen as taking inspiration from the Middle Ages, as shown by his

[672] Hoffmann, 'Self-Ensnared: collaboration with Nazi Germany', pp. 28-31.
[673] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 42.
[674] Philip Farwell Bankwitz, 'French Defeat in 1940 and its Reversal in 1944-1945: The Deuxième Division Blindée' in Joel Blatt (ed.) *The French Defeat of 1940* (Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1998), p. 338.

inhabiting a medieval castle. Just as Tiffauges partially inhabits a reality that is to a degree constructed from his own ideas of a mythical past, Swing Troubadour of *La Ronde de Nuit* inhabits an existence with his two mute friends, who are a construction of his own mind. Similarly, Saint-Loup's *Les Hérétiques* is a testament to his unrepentant wartime career. However, although their mental state may be questionable, this tenuous grasp on reality is a fitting allegory for the real-life world they inhabit. By participating in military and paramilitary collaboration, the characters of each of the three novels exist in shadowy underground worlds, not belonging to mainstream society. The characters in these novels, and the people they represent, were unable to emerge freely from the shadows after the war, which contrasts them to former resistance members. However, the novels and characters discussed here also importantly illustrate that military and paramilitary collaboration was a subject that was openly considered and examined in the public, cultural domain.

Chapter Six: Collaboration and *la mode rétro*: Familial Memories of *les années noires*

For Henry Rousso, the years 1971 to 1974 saw the return of the repressed, *le retour du refoulé*, after a lengthy period during which memories of collaborators and their actions were submerged by Gaullist ideology: what had been covered under a reassuring myth of national resistance returned to public awareness. Furthermore, such memories returned with an unexpected force which saw the beginning of *la mode rétro*, a cultural phenomenon which lasted throughout the 1970s and reappraised, through cultural media, the conduct of the French during the Nazi Occupation, who up until this point were largely considered to have been involved in only minimal collaboration.[675]

According to Rousso, the period 1954 to 1971 (*le refoulement*) was a time when Gaullist memory dominated public political discourse, and sought to silence any reminder of wartime divisions. As Rousso comments, 'le Général avait pratiqué tour à tour l'exorcisme de Vichy, et l'histoire sainte et édifiante de la Résistance'.[676] However, a number of developments after 1968 unsettled the image many had of the Occupation. Amongst the most important developments identified by Rousso were the release of Marcel Ophüls' *Le Chagrin et la pitié* in 1971, Louis Malle's *Lacombe Lucien* in 1974, and the French translation of Robert Paxton's *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order 1940-1944* (*La France de Vichy*) in 1972.[677] These, in different ways, all played an important role in ushering in a new period for France's troubled relationship with its wartime past.

---

[675] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 118-154.
[676] *Ibid*., p.120.
[677] *Ibid*., pp. 121-139, p.152.

Literature, Collaboration and the *Mode Rétro*

This analysis of the period proved influential for Alan Morris's *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed: Writers and the 'Mode Rétro' in Post-Gaullist France*. Examining Rousso's theory, Morris takes this hypothesis of political narrative as a starting point through which literary coverage of the war years during the period of *la mode rétro* can be examined. Thus, from 1944 to 1969, primarily through the efforts of de Gaulle, the years of occupation were seen in an 'excessively optimistic' light, which minimalized and readily forgave the most excessive forms of collaboration, whilst celebrating the achievements of the Resistance.[678] For Morris, 'this collective myth of a *France résistante*, for that is what it amounted to, showed itself to be so appealing that, for a full quarter of a century, it was to prove immune to all attacks upon it'.[679] The period following this is therefore the focus of Morris's study, analysing the literary representations of the years of Occupation that both show a developing interest in the war, but moreover - and more importantly to this study - further demythified the war years and led to a decisive reaction against the prevailing political views of the previous twenty-five years: 'The Resistance was brought crashing down from its lofty pedestal and, conversely, the Collaboration was elevated from its post-war purgatory'.[680]

In this view, Morris expands on and develops on existing understanding of how the war years were remembered. This political memory was a form of fable, and in an important article (used by Morris is his work) this was explained by Colin Nettelbeck:

---

[678] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 179.
[679] *Ibid*., p. 179.
[680] *Ibid*., p. 179.

> France, after being badly demoralised in the 1930s by incompetent leadership and the divisive struggles of party politics, was crushed in 1940 by superior weaponry and rather let down by its British allies. Even while she was being bled dry by the brutal repressive army that occupied her for four years, she resisted bravely: from the outside, with de Gaulle's Free French, and from within, through various clandestine movements. Thus France regained her freedom and honour by driving the Germans out – with a little help, of course, from the Allies. The few villains who had helped the Germans were purged: the collaborationist Vichy government in the first place, with the ignoble old Marshal Pétain being sent off into exile, and the even more ignoble Laval being shot; scurrilous intellectuals, too, like the novelist-journalist Brasillach, were sent before the firing squad or to jail. France could once again stand proudly as a united people, joined by their historic participation in the unrelenting struggle against the Hitlerian Occupant.[681]

According to Nettelbeck, this understanding of the past continued to develop under the Fourth Republic, reaching its apotheosis under de Gaulle's presidency, and existed until it was challenged and refuted by the *mode rétro*, which began attempts to provide a believable account of the events and behaviour of the war years, something which Gaullism did not allow for.[682]

The reasons Morris identifies for this are focused on two factors. Firstly, the absence of de Gaulle, who had died in 1970, deprived former *résistants* not only of their chief advocate, but also the man who had become the embodiment of resistance since 1940. Secondly, the 1970s saw the arrival of a new generation of French adults who had no direct experience of the war years, and were therefore cut off from and denied access to the events of the Occupation which their parents and older generation had experienced.[683] This search for the past had an effect on literature, which sought to question the political silence surrounding issues of collaboration, and France's role in the war. For some (such as the authors discussed

---

[681] Colin Nettelbeck, 'Getting the Story Right: Narratives of the Second World War in Post-1968 France', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989), p. 256.
[682] *Ibid*., p. 293.
[683] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 180.

in this chapter) this focused on an attempt to find and come to terms with a real parent (for Pascal Jardin and Marie Chaix, both important authors considered by Alan Morris and re-considered in this chapter) or an attempt to create a false parent in the form of *passé supplémentaire* (as in the work of Patrick Modiano, perhaps the most important author of *la mode rétro*, and again, considered by Morris and reconsidered in this chapter). The opportunity for older generations to either deny such a past, as did many *anciens combattants*, or for the first time to openly discuss it, finally allowed younger generations access to a heritage they had been denied both on a personal level but also by the political powers which had dominated the French nation.[684]

Yet it is also possible that Morris, following Rousso's lead, over-emphasised the novel aspects of the *mode rétro*. As previous chapters have shown, the periods of 'unfinished mourning' and 'repression' that Rousso identifies do not fit comfortably with literary representations of the war years published during these times. How, then, does this affect what Morris, following on from Rousso, has to say about literary representations of the war in the period of the *mode rétro*? Importantly, it should first be noted that as Morris's primary focus is the *mode rétro*, his acceptance of Rousso's ideas lead to an analysis not principally devoted to the nuances of the period 1945-1971. With this in mind, according to Morris, 'anything that went against the tide sank in the swell', with Resistance memories being 'so solid, something of an earthquake would be needed to destroy them'[685]. Thus, before 1971, 'any text which rehabilitated the collaborator was a bad text'.[686] Whilst this accepts that such texts existed, it downplays their influence. This is an

[684] *Ibid*., p. 180.
[685] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 20.
[686] *Ibid*., p. 24.

important nuance, for Morris's tangential viewpoint as an example of the acceptance and application of Rousso's political analysis to the cultural sphere has also been used as a basis for further studies.[687]

These viewpoints raise important questions, stemming as they do from a view of collaboration and the past which seems somewhat Manichean, with any novel that gave a nuanced view of collaboration seen, ironically, as 'bad'. Perhaps most importantly, is collaboration really rehabilitated and brought to the fore by the literary representations of the period of *la mode rétro*?[688] Despite the fact that all of the works selected for this period examine collaboration through individuals shown to possess human qualities, examined through the paradigm of family relationships, it seems unlikely they could, in reality, rehabilitate individual collaborators. These works show the individual collaborator, and can, particularly in the case of Chaix, attempt to present a situation whereby decent individuals make an initially poor or ill-informed choice and begin a path of collaboration without full knowledge of their actions of the surrounding circumstances.[689] Yet, as the example of Chaix illustrates, it is impossible for these texts to be read and the activities of the collaborators portrayed not questioned. This in turn raises the issue of fiction being analysed as historical representation without consideration of wider historical knowledge: to believe that texts about the recent past could be read at face value,

---

[687] Morris has been cited, for example, by Richard J. Golsan (see *Vichy's Afterlife*, p. 60). Morris's views echo the writings of contemporary critics such as Christian Zimmer (see 'La Paille dans le discours de l'ordre', *Les Temps modernes* 336 (July 1974), p. 2495.) and Michel Foucault, in an interview with Pascal Bonitzer and Serge Toubiana (see 'Anti-Rétro: Entretien avec Michel Foucault', *Cahiers du cinema* 251-252 (July-August 1974), p. 10. Rousso's analysis is applied to the novel by Lynne A. Higgins in *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics – Fiction and the Representation of History in Postwar France* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1996) pp. 9-10. For specific literary studies, examples can be found in Roux, *Figures de l'occupation*, pp. 20-22, and in Charles O'Keefe, *A Riffaterrean Reading of Patrick Modiano's 'La place de l'étoile* (Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 2005), p. 2-3.

[688] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 54.

[689] Claire Gorrara, *Women's Representations of the Occupation in Post-'68 France* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998), p. 96.

and without consideration of wider knowledge, would require a credulous audience. Although Chaix's search for her father through literature does elicit some sympathy, it cannot remove the taint her father's involvement in collaboration brought to him.[690]

Yet Morris is correct to sees such works of *la mode rétro* as having rehabilitative qualities, attempting to humanize the collaborators they present. This is partly achieved through the manner in which they question a past that was, and remained, difficult to come to terms with. For example, the 1950s were a period that 'demonstrate[d] that the French were still unsure whether to bury the past or resurrect it'.[691] Yet it seems unlikely the past was either buried or resurrected; instead, more complex and nuanced versions were in operation from the end of the war onwards, as previous chapters have discussed.[692] In literary terms, this modifies Morris's acceptance of Rousso's view that throughout the 1950s and 1960s memory was repressed, and the suggestion that, by 1969, 'the prevalent view of the *années noires* had scarcely changed since 1945'.[693]

Morris adapts a more balanced view of the war years. For example, he agrees that there were writers independent of the 'dominant' Gaullist myth, although the significance of this is underplayed.[694] Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that whilst the phenomenon of the *mode rétro* within literary representations of the

[690] It is also interesting to question whether such novels could really rehabilitate collaborators at the same time as Paxton's important *Vichy France*, which established France's complicity in the Holocaust. Although perhaps not widely read, it is identified by Rousso as an important work in the development of memory of the war years.
[691] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 26.
[692] This view has also been questioned by writers in individual studies. For example, see Nicholas Hewitt, 'The Literature of the Right and the Liberation: the Case of the 'Hussards'', in H. R Kedward and Nancy Wood (eds.), *The Liberation of France – Image and Event* (Oxford: Berg, 1995), pp. 285-296.
[693] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 35.
[694] *Ibid*., p. 35.

Occupation displays many of the traits of previous works, widespread interest in the war during the period of the early 1970s cannot be denied. Yet this interest utilised existing traits of representation within literature which would have been disapproved of by de Gaulle and the Resistance, but which nevertheless existed within French society, and which could be used by writers such as those selected for this chapter to create their own works. Therefore, works by Jardin (*La Guerre à neuf ans*), Chaix (*Les Lauriers du lac de Constance*), and Modiano (*Les Boulevards de ceinture*) will be considered with these issues in mind. Whilst aspects of their work have been the focus of much existing research, attention in this chapter will primarily be paid to factors which can be contrasted, in concluding, with works discussed in the previous three chapters, to discover to what extent they continue themes already present in collaboration novels published in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, as discussed in previous chapters.

Pascal Jardin's Vichy

Pascal Jardin was the son of Jean Jardin, a banker who was later to serve firstly as *chef de cabinet* to Vichy's Finance Minister, Yves Bouthillier, and from April 1942 as Laval's influential *directeur de cabinet*, until, in October 1943, he was appointed Vichy's ambassador to Switzerland.[695] Before becoming an author, with the 1971 publication of *La Guerre à neuf ans* (an account of his wartime childhood), Pascal

[695] Jean-Paul Cointet, *Histoire de Vichy* (Paris: Perrin, 2003), p. 234.

Jardin had been well-known as a film scriptwriter. Although *La Guerre à neuf ans* can basically be described as an account of Jardin's wartime childhood following a chronological path interpolated with references to his contemporary life, this minimalist, albeit truthful, description underrates its multifaceted nature. In light of its use as a source with which to examine collaboration and its representation, what sort of text is *La Guerre à neuf ans* - fiction? Memoir? History? Indeed, is it possible to classify? There are, without doubt, parts of *La Guerre à neuf ans* which can be seen as non-factual, either through the difficulty of attempting to remember events which were twenty-five to thirty years old for Jardin, or through deliberate invention by one whose scriptwriting ability is shown by his capacity to re-create events which seem to conjure the necessary detail for a film set design, and illustrate Jardin's reputation for technically irreproachable work.[696] Jardin himself admits this, although claims never to intend to distort facts: 'Je dois faire une réserve. Rien de ce que je raconte n'est inventé. Cependant, en ce qui concerne les dates exactes, la chronologie du récit, je peux faire des erreurs. Ma mémoire est celle du photographe, pas de l'historien et telle personne qui viendrait prétendre ne plus s'être trouvée à Vichy en janvier 1943 mais, déjà, à Londres ou à Alger depuis six ou sept mois, il ne serait pas impossible que ces personnes-là puissent avoir raison.'[697]

It would seem, in all probability, that Jardin in fact deliberately fabricated some parts of the work. It is impossible to conceive of him doing otherwise if he could

[696] Fanny Chèze, *Pascal Jardin: Le prince, le fou et l'enfant* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 2010), p. 94.
[697] Jardin, *GNA,* p. 78.

improve on an event or idea within the text,[698] yet deliberate falsification is difficult to prove. For example, was Jardin's toy railway really stolen by the FFI at the Liberation?[699] Was he given this train set for Christmas? Was it left at his grandparents' house? Was it stolen? If stolen, was it done so specifically by the FFI? These questions show how, ultimately, it is impossible to verify Jardin's account of this event, as with much of what is written in *La Guerre à neuf ans*. What can therefore be concluded is that, unwittingly or not, elements of fiction are present in a work which, of the three selected to examine the *mode rétro*, purports to present the most 'truthful' account, Jardin openly claiming that at least some of his work is based on memory. With this in mind, it is perhaps most sensible to state that he has produced 'autobiography enhanced by a zest for fiction'[700].

A strong case can be made for classifying the text as memoir. Although it (undoubtedly) contains fictional elements, it is based on genuine reflections by Jardin on the war, and in particular his father. Certainly, some essence of Jardin's childhood and the world in which he existed are captured, as he states: 'Par contre, sur les noms, les visages, les péripéties, les lieux, les toilettes des femmes, les manies des hommes, pour tout ce qui se rapporte aux gestes, au verbe, au scandale, à l'émotion, à l'odeur de la vie, je ne me trompe pas'.[701] Jardin is attempting a re-creation of his childhood through a cultural medium based on memory, with all the pitfalls that memories can suffer. However, that it is based on realities cannot be doubted. Indeed, it can also be seen as a memoir in that Jardin is reflecting on and giving his views from his particular vantage point, without attempting to be

[698] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 169-170.
[699] Jardin, *GNA,* p. 141.
[700] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 170.
[701] Jardin, *GNA*, pp. 78-79.

impartial. Although Jardin could declare 'mon récit est apolitique', in reality this is not the case, as his rather biased comments on the activities of those involved in resistance show. [702]

Does the work have facets which could justify it being described as a factually accurate description of past events? (A question that can be asked also of Chaix.) The book purports to represent and understand events that happened in the past. There are facts contained within the book that are historically verifiable. At a basic level, it cannot be disputed that his father was Laval's *directeur de cabinet* within some of the period that the book describes, that this naturally had an effect on young Pascal's life, and that Pascal could offer some understanding of his father and recollection of their wartime life. This in turn differentiates *La Guerre à neuf ans* from other fictional narratives that examine collaboration, and which are not based on direct experience. This does not however make it an historical work, as it does not attempt to carry out one of the historian's primary aims: to unravel the remains of the past to establish what did and did not occur.[703]

However, whilst Jardin's work cannot be seen as a work of history in the sense that it does not provide a factually precise and verifiable representation of the past, it is possible that it can be used as an historical source, both for the war itself and the period in which it was written; it therefore remains a more accurate and informative source than either Chaix or Modiano, even if Jardin was heavily influenced by

[702] *Ibid.,* p.79. For Jardin's thought on resistance activity, see below.
[703] This does not, however, take account of thinking in some post-modernist circles that would deny the possibility of objective historical research and of a wholly fixed and unalterable meaning. Instead, all readings and sources are valid. Whilst such thinking can lead to stimulating new approaches to history and historical methods, some facts are fundamentally verifiable and cannot be re-read. Evans, *In Defence of History*, p. 103.

Modiano's work.[704] Some parts are by no means unique, telling of well-documented and familiar events, such as Pétain's speech of 16 June 1940, or the arrival of the Germans in the town where Jardin is staying at the time of the Occupation. What does give these events a certain interest however is their description from the perspective of a child. Whilst *La Guerre à neuf ans* is by no means the only childhood memoir of the war years, it is still (often) possible for historians to overlook childhood experience of events during the war years, such as the Exodus in the face of German invasion.[705] Moreover, Jardin's memoir is unique in offering a child's view of the Vichy regime at close quarters. It must be stated that Jardin's youth and issues of memory (both accidental forgetfulness and deliberate inventiveness to create a good story) mean that, as a source descriptions of individual events *La Guerre à neuf ans* must be handled cautiously. Conversely, Jardin has a certain freedom allowed him in telling his story. Whilst many at Vichy would not want to incriminate, or link themselves to the regime, Jardin, who had no choice, is not constrained by this. Although it is possible to criticise Jardin's work in this light as 'he was far too young to understand the period in the first place', his work does allow a child's view to be heard.[706] In addition, qualms about highlighting his still-living father's role could have possibly given Jardin some

[704] Chèze, *Pascal Jardin*, p. 191.
[705] For example, see Diamond's *Fleeing Hitler*. Whilst giving an overview of the Exodus, Diamond illustrates well the effect on ordinary people through the use of eyewitness accounts, memoirs and diaries. However, despite their large-scale involvement, children's experience is largely overlooked. It is, however, the subject of François Boyer's *Jeux interdits,* the story of Paulette, a young girl who loses her parents in the Exodus, and examines the traumatic effect this has on her (François Boyer *Jeux interdits* (Paris: Editions de minuit, 1952). A film of the story was also made (*Jeux interdits*, dir René Clément, 1952).
[706] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 128. It is perhaps worth speculating on many adults' ability to 'understand' much of what happened to them in the war years.

pause for thought, but his disapproval does not seem to have unduly restrained him.[707]

Turning to the period in which Jardin wrote *La Guerre à neuf ans*, it can be seen that Jardin is one of the more interesting writers of the period labelled the *mode rétro*, when writers supposedly undermined an alleged collective and predominant Gaullist 'myth' of the resistance, which had thus far dominated representations of collaboration and resistance (whether or not this over-riding Gaullist 'myth' had the hold ascribed to it remains to be seen). Alan Morris is right to place Jardin's work amongst those by authors such as Marie Chaix and Evelyne Le Garrec, who are 'orphans' of wartime collaboration,[708] and it is this 'orphaned' status that can be seen as important to Jardin. Due to the heavy workload and distant nature of Jean Jardin, which meant he was often absent from his son's life, Pascal is forced to go in search of his father and his identity in order to understand who he is today. Pascal believes he has been shaped, as others are, by childhood and by his father, as Jardin eventually turns into what he believes to be a replica of his father. Thus Jardin is not only going in search of the past, but is also bringing it to the present, an idea represented by ignoring traditional chronology, done away with as Jardin moves between the present and the past.[709]

[707] As is noted on Jean Jardin and his response to *GNA* and Pascal Jardin's subseqent memoirs: 'car de son point de vue, les trois premiers livres de son fils sont un mauvais coup qu'il encaisse mal'. Pierre Assouline, *Une éminence grise: Jean Jardin (1904-1976)* (Saint-Armand (Cher): Balland, 1986), p. 453. Presumably, Pascal Jardin would have taken a more understanding approach to his own son's childhood memoirs focusing on Pascal, had he lived. See Alexandre Jardin, *Le Zubial* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997).
[708] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 121.
[709] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 128.

As already indicated, *La Guerre à neuf ans* supposedly fits into a trend in the French national consciousness which overthrew Gaullist 'myths' about the war from the period around 1970, and, as discussed in the introduction, Morris has provided a reading of the text with this sequence of events in mind. Thus, Jardin writes despite 'a blatant lack of first-hand documentation' caused by an 'overwhelming silence from the older generation'.[710] Certainly he is writing from a lack of documentation. It would be difficult to write a childhood memoir based on a variety of documents - such is the nature of childhood - and Jardin's work should instead be seen as an evocation of a child's world.[711]

However, was Jardin writing against such an intransigent wall of silence? Jardin is writing of his experience of Vichy, part of the alleged Gaullist 'myth', seeing as it did a French people almost wholly behind the resistance groups, save for those supporting the Germans. Largely, if such a 'myth' did have widespread belief, Jardin's memoirs fit into this, in part, telling as they do of collaborators whose existence had always been admitted, if not freely discussed. However, to claim that Vichy and collaboration was largely not discussed is false. Morris himself admits that Jardin acknowledges, in particular, a debt to Robert Aron's *Histoire de Vichy*, which was first published in France in 1955. Jardin, making reference to works on the war, writes: 'et pourtant, si j'en crois des ouvrages aussi éminents que *l'Histoire de Vichy* de Robert Aron',[712] suggesting Aron's work is part of a wider field of works about that war that he has knowledge of. Morris takes this point further when he adds 'even these sources remain somewhat fragmentary and irritatingly

[710] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[711] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 171.
[712] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 80.

incomplete'. (When Morris refers to 'sources', he does so because as well as the specified *l'Histoire de Vichy*, Jardin can also be seen to rely on the 'archives' of Jean Jardin).[713]

Is it therefore true that 'Jardin's reliance on his own recollections is more or less total, as he himself indicates in his contention that "J'écris un livre de souvenirs"'?[714] If he is indeed at the beginning of the *mode rétro* as is contended, coming after the Gaullist 'myth' which repressed acknowledgement of any widespread collaboration, focused away from Vichy and towards the heroics of the resistance, Jardin would have little to base his recollections on, and these sources would indeed be 'fragmentary and incomplete', as Morris suggests, leading Jardin to rely on his own memory. Certainly it is true when Jardin writes 'J'écris un livre de souvenirs', but this is where suggestions about the novelty of the *mode rétro* theory require development, for Jardin has indeed written a book of memories, but not just his memories.[715] One of the reasons *La Guerre à neuf ans* should be handled with caution by historians is because many of Jardin's memories can be seen as wide of the mark, and although this is due to Jardin's attempt to recall facts from thirty years ago, it is also, importantly, due to Jardin's memory taking in other information about collaboration, and the war years, in the intervening period. He had not existed in a life devoid of recollections of how the war actually was, as believers of the Gaullist 'myth' would seem to suggest. Instead, he produced a work that was not just a product of memories of the war years but also what others had said about the war, his father, and collaboration in the intervening period. This

[713] Morris *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed,* p. 128.
[714] *Ibid*., p. 128.
[715] Rousso also felt that Jardin's style was 'fidèle à sa mémoire, sinon à l'histoire'. Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 150.

theory would suggest that the dominance of the Gaullist 'myth' (and Rousso's Vichy Syndrome, of which it is an important part[716]) cannot be applied to literature.

Naturally, it is impossible to examine all aspects within the work and to pronounce on whether they actually happened, or whether they happened to, or near Jardin, if they are made up, and if so whether deliberately, or from mis-information from other sources. It is therefore also impossible to produce definitively an example of a fact or idea and trace it to its original source. This does not preclude examples of information Jardin has taken in at some point, however, that he had not experienced himself, but that found their way onto the pages of *La Guerre à neuf ans*, even if Jardin's reporting is not entirely reliable. Two can be found in Jardin's visit to his grandparents in Evreux during spring 1943. Describing a walk with his grandfather after an air raid, Jardin recalls their visit to the cathedral. Jardin states that 'il lui a manqué sa plus grosse, sa plus belle tour'.[717] Evreux cathedral did not have its largest tower destroyed by an air raid, although it did suffer some damage in 1940 during the German invasion, and it is possible that Jardin has taken this fact and either deliberately or accidentally moulded it to part of his narrative. This can similarly be seen in Jardin's description of another incident during this holiday in Normandy: 'Une fois par heure environ, le ciel mugit au-dessus de nos têtes et un monstre d'acier vomissant des flammes déchire l'obscurité dans un sifflement de fin du monde. Ce sont les V1 et les V2 de M. von Braun'.[718]

[716] Rousso, *Syndrome de Vichy*, pp. 77-117.
[717] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 155.
[718] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 157.

As V1 rockets did not begin to be launched until June 1944, by which point the Jardin family had moved to Switzerland following Jean Jardin's taking up of his appointment there in November 1943,[719] this is clearly an impossible account, and must be based on information gained by Jardin after the war. Whilst such examples point to Jardin's lack of reliability, they also suggest his memory is shaped by wider historical knowledge of the war years. Whilst by 1971 Vichy had not been the subject of the large-scale academic study that it has today, as has already been stated Jardin refers to Aron's *l'Histoire de Vichy*. In addition to this, he also reports having read another 'historical' work on Vichy, by Henri du Moulin de Labarthète, Pétain's former *directeur de cabinet*: 'Ce hobereau grinçant écrira plus tard le seul livre vivant sur l'histoire de Vichy: *le Temps des illusions*. C'est, paraît-il, bourré d'erreurs et d'inventions'.[720] Whilst Jardin's attitude to the factuality of the work is a further reminder that all he says should not be taken at face value, it does point to a further source and provide evidence that Jardin was not entirely basing his work on his own memories. What, then, were the other works that Jardin could have either consciously or unconsciously taken information from after the war for use in *La Guerre à neuf ans*?

Despite that fact that Morris suggests Jardin, as an element of the *mode rétro*, is part of a wave of authors breaking with the past with their writings on collaboration, he also notes that some of Jardin's views are not ground-breaking, citing the 1948 examples of Claude Jamet's *Fifi Roi* and Maurice Sachs' *La Chasse à courre*, which both represented a view which suggested collaboration with

[719] Assouline, *Une Éminence grise,* p. 166
[720] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 82.

Germany was a sensible option during the war.[721] Whilst it can be seen that these works could be part of the debate in the immediate post-war period in which the Vichy regime was judged, it seems unlikely they were then repressed as completely as Rousso suggests. As previous chapters have examined, many high-profile authors provided representations of collaboration, and while it must be acknowledged that it would be impossible to discover in any great detail what Jardin had read and with whom he had discussed the war, it would not appear too unlikely that Jardin, a man who moved in artistic circles due to his career and had an interest in Vichy through his youthful links to it, would be unaware of developments in this field. Although only conjecture, would Jardin have been unaware of Louis-Ferdinand Céline's end-of-war trilogy of *D'un Château L'Autre* (published in 1957), *Nord* (published in 1960) and *Rigadon* (published in 1969), which contain vivid representations of collaborators and some of the men Jardin claims to have met? Although nothing can be proved conclusively as to Jardin's knowledge of these works, they do give examples that works examining collaboration do exist for the period prior to the *mode rétro*, and this in turn would suggest that Jardin was by no means reliant solely upon his own memories.

Before turning to Jardin's representation of collaboration, it is worth giving final consideration to the concept of time within *La Guerre à neuf ans* and how this affects its status as a blend of fiction, memoir and history. For Jardin, Vichy is not entirely in the past, and its links to the present can be seen in Jardin's abandonment of strict chronological style, choosing instead to leap back and forth from the present to the past, providing a kaleidoscopic view of both. Partly, Jardin is a

[721] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 142, fn. 2.

prisoner of the past. He compares what he has in common with his children, for example, and finds nothing, formed by a break in continuity between those born around the time of the *Front populaire* and those born after the Liberation. Yet he is also playing with time, as can be seen with his chronology. Is Jardin bringing the past to the present, giving his version of it to the reader, or is the reader joining Jardin in journeying to the past, assisted by him in creating their own version of the war years both within their own readings of the work and their own private memories? This would in part depend on the reader. Many of Jardin's age and above could and would return to the past precisely because they had a war-time past, and memories of such formed since the war, and linked to their own experience, to return to. Younger generations could not.

Turning from the nature of the work, what does Jardin's representation of collaboration attempt to illustrate? The major figure involved in collaboration in the text is Jean Jardin, Pascal's father. Yet this does not mean Jardin is in a position to explain his father's decisions to collaborate: far from it. Although the war years are a shared experience between Jardin and his father, Jardin is conversely detached from the process, as he does not know his remote and enigmatic father (or, for that matter, his mother) and seeks to gain some knowledge of him through writing. As Morris pointed out: 'so endemic was this parental, and particularly paternal absence to become that, shortly before his death in 1980, Jardin would claim to have had no more than ten private chats with his father throughout his whole life'.[722] This is perhaps not a problem particular to Pascal Jardin: 'Qui est réellement mon père? Quelles ont été ses activités et quelles sont-elles encore? Sur la plage de Deauville,

[722] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 122.

à une voisine de cabine qui lui demandait ce que faisait son mari, ma mère a répondu avec candeur, l'été dernier «Je ne l'ai jamais su»'.[723]

It would thus seem that Jean Jardin was inscrutable. This does not however prevent Jardin from providing a description of his father's role as a collaborator; after assisting with running the railways during the Exodus, Jardin's father is first directly linked to the government in January 1941, just after he has been made *chef de cabinet* to the Minister of Finance, Yves Bouthillier. This is swiftly followed by Jean Jardin's appointment on 20 April 1942 as Laval's *directeur de cabinet*, placing Jean Jardin in a role in which he is to remain for the rest of the narrative, culminating with the family's departure for Switzerland on 30 October 1943.

Yet Jean Jardin's role is never made explicit. He is often present, and yet remains peculiarly elusive, unavailable to direct viewing, but his image and world available as a mirror image provided by other individuals in the world in which he exists. This can be witnessed in a visit by Jardin and his mother to Jean Jardin at *l'Hotel du Parc*, where the Vichy government was based.[724] Upon arrival, they are greeted by 'deux soldats rutilants qui montent la garde', and on entering the building pass the door to Laval's office. From here they meet a panoply of Vichy figures. First is Monsieur Moysset, a friend of the Marshal's who laughs constantly whilst talking, and who pats Jardin's head. Next comes Charles Rochat of the Foreign Ministry, concerned about a member of his secretariat who wishes to marry an English girl, then Henry du Moulin de Labarthète, who, although described as an 'hobereau grinçant', had written in Jardin's opinion the only lively account of Vichy. Admiral

[723] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 129.
[724] For the rest of this paragraph, see Jardin, *GNA*, pp. 81-87.

Estéva, French resident Minister in Tunis (and later member of the *Organisation de l'armée secrète* during the Algerian War) subsequently appears, a 'vieillard coléreux et mystique', next appears, and is followed by the rather incongruous Georges Bidault, who was to become a high-profile resistance member, and later foreign minister and prime minister in the Fourth Republic.

Jardin's description continues until he and his mother reach Jean Jardin's office, where Paul Marion, Minister of Information, is found, and who is subject to much discussion within the text.[725] From here, Jardin takes us to the lunch which marked the culmination of his visit to Vichy, attended by more than thirty people, including Paul Badoin, Abel Bonnard and General Weygand. Yet where was Jean Jardin? In this description of a visit to his office, the reader is taken from the front door of *l'Hotel du Parc*, through the world of the Vichy government via a range of historical figures, yet Jean Jardin is missing, in what must be a literary absence, as a physical absence is not commented on by Jardin. The reader can examine Jean Jardin's world and learn something of him from it, but not directly from the man himself. Whilst, as in much of the rest of the book, collaboration is discussed and represented, Jean Jardin is not present.

However, although this example is representative of Jean Jardin's role within the book (as well as within Pascal Jardin's life), examples do exist of him with other collaborators. There is the example of a family visit to Pétain's home at the Château de Charmeil, where Pascal and his father take a walk in the park with the Marshal, although collaboration is not mentioned explicitly in this case. The policy of

[725] For further details, see below.

collaboration is, however, discussed in light of Laval's 1942 speech in favour of a German victory during a conversation in which Jardin disturbs his father and Jacques (better-known as René) Bousquet:

> Perdu dans ce rêve passionnel, qu'est la folie politique, les deux hommes m'ont vite oublié. Sans même se pousser d'un mètre, juste au-dessus de ma tête, ils parlent à mi-voix en m'aspergeant de cendres de cigarette. Bousquet affirme que, par le discours qu'il vient de faire, Laval a perdu tout crédit. Comme mon père ne répond pas, Bousquet lui dit : «Vous n'avez donc pas parlé de ça avec lui ?» La cigarette consumée aux deux tiers danse sur les lèvres de mon père
> - Si, je lui ai dit : «Si les Alliés gagnent la guerre, vous serez pendu… »
> - Et alors ?
> - Il a répondu, c'est aussi une fin pour un homme politique.[726]

Yet although Jardin has linked (as is impossible to not) his father to collaboration, he has been careful to draw a distinction between his father and Laval, whose pro-German policy has been seen to be questioned by collaborators who would wish France to remain neutral, aware as they are of the possibility of an Allied victory. Yet even Laval is represented in a manner which benefits Jean Jardin: as Colin Nettelbeck notes, even Laval is brought into 'an aura of basic goodness'.[727]

Jardin is also careful to lessen the extent of his father's collaboration, and by extension, that of many others involved in collaboration, in linking him to the protection of Jews. This is partly done by fact, but is also achieved through association. Jean Jardin's precise views towards Jews, anti-Semitic measures and the Holocaust are never revealed. However, Jardin does make his own, allegedly wartime, views known. He sees no difference between Jews and other people, and

[726] Jardin, *GNA*, pp. 107-108.
[727] Nettelbeck, 'Getting the Story Right', pp. 278-279.

when he asks the Jewish Dr. Robert Worms to explain, he provides answers which answer nothing and can give no real reason for events that are taking place. This conversation takes place whilst Worms is staying in the Jardin house, which implicitly links Jean Jardin to those opposed to measures against Jews through his action, in addition to his son's opposition to anti-Semitic measures. After this link is carefully made, it is reinforced by Jardin when Robert Aron is specifically aided by Jean Jardin. Jean Jardin is shown to have provided Aron with false papers which would enable him to leave for Algiers, but this plan is thwarted by the German Occupation of the unoccupied zone. Aron, unable to leave France, is hidden by Jean Jardin. He is discovered, however, when he interrupts a lunch party, attended by the German diplomat Krug von Nidda, on his way for a walk in the garden. Jardin makes clear his father's risk in his description on his reaction to Aron's arrival, for 'le voyant apparaître, mon père est littéralement frappé de stupeur'.[728] Although von Nidda expects to be introduced, Aron simply continues to the garden, leaving a difficult silence behind him, only broken by von Nidda's advice that one should never explain, thus saving Jean Jardin.

Jardin clearly tries to display his father in a positive light through his perceived distancing of him from Laval and by his assistance to individual Jews, linking him to the attitudes of many who, during the war, remained silent about Vichy's anti-Semitic legislation, and continued to interact with 'undesirable' Jews.[729] Yet he also helps his father's image through his sympathetic portrayal of collaborators as individuals. As above, Paul Marion is singled out in this part of Jardin's account.[730]

[728] Jardin, *GNA*, p. 138.
[729] Fogg, *The Politics of Everyday Life*, p. 143.
[730] For the rest of this paragraph, see Jardin, *GNA*, pp. 83-85.

Whilst those met on the way to his father's office were given simple descriptions based on appearance and personality, devoid of judgement on their roles (aside from Jacques Benoist-Méchin, whose post-war home is the major interest to him), Jardin gives greater attention to Marion, and notes his collaboration. Marion is described as 'un collaborateur fanatique'. Yet despite this, Jardin states he was 'mon ami, mon véritable ami', and it can be seen that, despite the forty-year difference between them, he talks to Jardin not as a child but as another human being. His first action upon Jardin's arrival is to show him the connecting doors between rooms hidden at the back of wardrobes (the Vichy government was based in former hotels) in vivid style; 'Petit père, c'est par là que passait l'adultère, entre deux piles de mouchoirs et une rangée de caleçons'. As Jardin states, 'Je l'aimais comme j'aimais tous ceux qui avaient le pouvoir et la folie de m'arracher à l'enfance'. This cannot help but humanise and somewhat endear Marion to the reader, despite his involvement in collaboration, an effect Jardin heightens in his description of Marion's fate, which is touching in its simplicity following Jardin's obvious affection him, adding to this effect; 'Il est mort après la guerre, dans d'horribles souffrances, d'un cancer généralisé. L'enfer l'avait cueilli de son vivant'.

What, then, is *La Guerre à neuf ans*, and what does it show of collaboration? Fundamentally memoir, it mixes fiction and history with this to form a kaleidoscopic view of Vichy during the mid-war years. Jardin's claims to be a-political cannot be taken at face value, for his view is forged by close childhood experience with collaborators and he is a man with many views on the world who has not entirely rejected the political, moral, and religious beliefs of his father. His

claim that Churchill instituted civil war in France by providing arms to the resistance would appear to fit well into a collaborator's understanding of the war, and his contention that, after the war, French workers still too often worked in concentration-camp like conditions speaks of disillusion with the post-war regime in what is a vacuous and distasteful comparison. Yet Jardin should not be ascribed an overtly pro-Vichy stance, for his overriding viewpoint, which would have angered former resistance members and Gaullists, was to see the war as an event where a variety of groups, none better than the others, competed for control, although this relativism can also be seen as a tacit defence of collaboration. Thus, when the Jardins' house is attacked, Pascal states that no one knew who it was who was attacking it. Were they Gestapo? Thieves? *Miliciens*? Peasants whose sons had been deported? This stance is best illustrated by an explanation given to Jardin by his mother, when the young boy asks her to explain the war situation to him:

> Mon chéri, Vichy est pour le moment la capitale politique de la France. Les Français qui refusent la collaboration avec l'Allemagne ont d'autres capitales, mais pas en France. L'une est en Afrique, à Alger, l'autre en Angleterre, à Londres. A Paris, le pouvoir administratif appartient aux Allemands. A Vichy, on rencontre des Japonais, des pétainistes, des lavalistes, des résistants gaullistes, giraudistes et communistes. On rencontre aussi des miliciens, des Allemands en civil, des Juifs que rien ne distingue physiquement des autres Français, des antisémites dont les pires sont Roumains et qu'il serait aisé de prendre pour des Juifs, pour la bonne raison qu'ils n'ont pas l'air français. Les partisans du maréchal Pétain sont des pétainistes, ceux du président Laval des collaborateurs. Ceux qui sont pour Alger sont des giraudistes. Ceux qui sont pour de Gaulle sont partout peu nombreux. Les Français qui s'engagent dans l'armée allemande par haine du communisme sont des germanophiles. Ceux qui font partie de la milice sont des tortionnaires. Ceux qui font sauter les trains sont des partisans. Enfin, tous ceux qui habitent les grandes villes sont, sans distinction d'opinion, des affamés. En ce qui concerne l'habitat, il se répartit en gros comme suit : ceux qui font du marché noir habitent partout. Ceux qui font de la résistance active

> n'habitent nulle part. Ceux qui font des coups de main habitent les maquis, et ceux qui ne font rien habitent chez eux.[731]

Whilst this viewpoint is certainly not one that would universally be agreed with, it does illustrate the use of the book by conveying a great deal about the way some would have viewed the war at that time, allowing the reader access to some of the issues and mentalities of that period. For example, the differences between supporters of Pétain and Laval can be seen as realistic, if glib, and factors such as this do lend the ideas Jardin's mother presents as a faithful portrait of the views someone in the period might hold. However, it can also be seen that humour is an important ingredient, as evidenced by the closing sentences on where people live. In its attempts at wit as a world view, it is somewhat too arch, and as Jardin himself states, was unintelligible to him at the time. Moreover, although many aspects of his mother's speech can be seen to be true, such a neat summing-up of the political situation in France can be seen as retrospective.[732]

As part of his book, Jardin visits the former family home from this period, and in his parents' bedroom discovers the cut-off telephone wires that had formerly been in use, over which many voices of collaboration had been carried. Although as Jardin states, 'ces lignes branchées sur un moment de l'histoire sont muettes à jamais', they do, however corroded - like Jardin's own memories - provide a link to the past and a metaphor for his work, for Jardin allows not only a glimpse of the war years themselves but also attitudes to the war in the period in which he wrote *La Guerre à neuf ans*.[733]

---

[731] Jardin, *GNA,* pp. 79-80.
[732] Lloyd, *Collabration and Resistance*, p. 171.
[733] Jardin, *GNA*., pp. 151-152.

Marie Chaix and Idealistic Memories

Another 'orphan' of parental wartime mistakes is Marie Chaix. Born on 3 February 1942, and married in 1968 to the journalist Jean-Francois Chaix she is the fourth child of Albert Beugras, right-hand man of Jacques Doriot, head of the *Parti populaire français* (PPF) during the Occupation.[734] Her historical literary work began with the death of her mother in 1971 and revolves around the theme of memory, her first novel, *Les Lauriers du lac de Constance*, being published in 1974. This work, like Jardin's, can be seen as a blend of historical memoir and fictional mediation, existing between the two, with a none too clear dividing line between these two genres.[735] However, whilst Jardin's focusing on Jean Jardin the private individual and father acts as an apologia for his official activities, Chaix's novel offers a sense of shame and burden at her father's activities.[736] The novel charts the political career of Albert B. (a style of naming which is in no way an attempt to conceal the identity of Beugras, but instead reinforces the man's distant nature), who in 1936 becomes involved with Jacques Doriot and the PPF. The story begins before the war, recounting Albert's pre-war political involvement, which eventually leads him into first following a policy of collaboration, before he eventually finds himself fleeing France in German uniform before trial and imprisonment. His story is told by Marie, a daughter born in 1942 (an autofictive device), who recalls the events which led Albert to this situation - the crowds of Nazi rallies in Berlin, the meetings of the PPF, the German dinner in the family

[734] Claire Gorrara 'Remembering the Collaborating Father in Marie Chaix's "Les Lauriers du lac du Constance" and Evelyne Le Garrec's "La Rive Allemande de ma mémoire"' in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European memories of the Second World War* (Oxford: Berghahn, 1999), p. 203.
[735] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 78.
[736] Jones, *Journeys of Rememberence*, p. 26.

home, the Normandy landings - until the final collapse at Mainau (a castle on an island on Lake Constance) and imprisonment of Albert in Fresnes. Marie's narration is justified by her own story, which, whilst naturally interlinked with that of her father, also recounts in a subplot her early childhood with her submissive and acquiescent musician mother. Her often-absent father's demise is seen as motivation for the story, which is an attempt to discover him, a theme which strongly resembles *La Guerre à neuf ans*, although in Chaix's case rather than her own memories she is assuming those of her father in her attempt to understand his past.[737]

This attempt to discover a family figure involved with collaboration, a trait which Chaix shares with Jardin, marks them apart from Modiano. Morris has identified this as an act of rehabilitation of collaborator parents by their children,[738] and this can be seen to particularly be the case with Chaix and her depiction of Albert B., a depiction which presents his situation and actions in a positive light as the story unfolds. Chaix begins this process by establishing Albert B., unlike the works of Jardin or Modiano, within a pre-war context that serves as a device to explain the beginnings of Albert B.'s path to collaboration, beginning in 1936. Albert is portrayed as a successful chemical engineer, professionally and academically able in his career, with a loving wife, Alice. Albert's world is then changed by a desire for action and the strikes of 1936, which give him a hatred of the left, and Bolsheviks in particular. This conflict in turn leads to him changing politically, as his traditional background and convictions would suggest: 'inexorablement, il se

[737] Katherine Cardin, 'Life as an "enfant de collabo": Marie Chaix's evolution, 1974 – 2005' in Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd (eds.) *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939-2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 225.
[738] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*, p. 54.

voue à la droite, soutenu par sa foi de Français, de catholique, de fils de militaire'.[739]

The presentation of these situations is constructed to ensure that the natural suspicion already present (through retrospective knowledge that Albert B. will support right-wing groups in the war) is not allowed to over-ride the 'truth' that is offered about him. This 'truth' shows him to be a caring employer concerned for the fate of his workers: 'se battre pour les ouvriers qu'il aime – dit-il – et comprend, en face des patrons qui ne comprennent plus rien mais qu'il va convaincre – croit-il'.[740] Thus, whilst he is anti-Bolshevik, he is also on the side of workers against factory owners, despite his own background as a part of the factory-owning class, illustrating a desire to cure the ills of society.

The strikes also allow Chaix to begin to develop the theme of patriotism as a motivator for Albert. As noted, the strikes convince him that it is his duty 'as a Frenchman' to turn politically to the Right, a suggestion quickly followed by a further political reference to 'les bolcheviques, ces errants, ces fils tarés de la France qui ne jurent que par Moscou'.[741] Whilst his views have the potential to appear ill-informed to the reader, they nevertheless give the impression of deeply-held patriotism. Having established this facet of Albert's personality, Chaix then further develops it after the war breaks out. Albert does his duty by joining up, and is sent to fight as a captain in the Levant. Chaix has this section narrated by the character of Albert, which allows a further examination of his patriotism, for he is

[739] Chaix, *LLC,* p. 5.
[740] *Ibid.,* p. 5.
[741] *Ibid*., p. 6.

able to relate for himself his own thoughts and feelings. He writes that 'j'ai été élevé dans la foi militaire, l'attachement à la terre natale et l'amour de la patrie', and it is these emotions which lead to him to engineer his call-up, despite the role as a manager of a munitions factory being available for him.[742] Chaix is bypassing the passage of time and the judicial and historical judgements of Albert. Whilst this can give greater understanding of the past Chaix wishes to present, it also means a collaborator takes charge of the story and our knowledge of the past, as well as allowing Albert to attempt to win our understanding (and perhaps establish some sort of empathy) at an early stage of the novel. This can be compared with Jardin, who can take his reader back because he can 'remember' the events he describes. Chaix was too young, so therefore uses a different form of 'invented' past.

By attempting to win understanding from the reader, Chaix can show Albert's descent into collaboration in a fairly sympathetic light, from his genuine tears at the fall of Paris in 1940 to his flight from France into Germany in 1944-45, even if in her role as an adult narrator Chaix fails to be fooled by her father's 'narration'.[743] However, Chaix, through her father's 'narrative', simultaneously attempts to show Albert not as a man who has chosen the path he follows, but instead as a man that is placed upon the path he follows by fate, and generally not seen as a 'villain'.[744] After the fall of Paris, he is shown as a supporter of de Gaulle, ready to travel to London with other battalion officers. However, the attack on the French Fleet by the English of 5 July changed all this, as Albert claims 'sans Mers el-Kébir, je ne

[742] Chaix, *LLC,* p. 27.
[743] Gorrara, 'Remembering the Collaborating Father', pp. 203-205.
[744] Katherine Cardin, 'Life as an "enfant de collabo"', p. 226.

serais pas rentré en France en 40, j'aurais rejoint les troupes gaullistes'.[745] This one action, represented as being totally out of the hands of Albert, dramatically changes the fortunes of himself and his family.

Returning to France, because of his pre-war involvement with the PPF, Albert becomes involved with Doriot once again, which directly leads to his collaboration. Albert is determined to resist the Germans at this point, and because of his pre-war involvement goes to see Doriot, to discuss his disappointment: 'Lorsque, démobilisé à Nîmes le 2 novembre 40, on rencontre ce pays-là et que l'on voit des Français, pas mécontents de leur sort dans ce pays occupé, bafoué, partagé, que fait-on ? On pleure au-dedans de soi, on se sent l'âme résistante, mais on ne prend pas le chemin de Londres, on s'en va voir Doriot'.[746] Yet Doriot does not see the situation as Albert does, insisting that, as Frenchmen, they must work with Germany to save as much of France as possible. Once again, by a twist of fate and powerful external influence, Albert becomes directly involved with collaboration.

Doriot retains his influence throughout the war, Chaix showing Albert to be hood-winked by him, flattered but also following because the ends will allow Albert to achieve the means he desires. Albert continues to be primarily interested in social problems, as he repeatedly tells Doriot, and Doriot does make allowances in the future for this: 'Patience Albert, je te donnerai un ministère. Mais en attendant, tout le monde doit mettre la main à la pâte sur le chemin de la victoire. A la guerre comme à la guerre'.[747] Thus, despite Doriot involving Albert in the creation of the

[745] Chaix *LLC.,* p. 31.
[746] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[747] Chaix *LLC.,* p. 55.

PPF's secret service and giving him personal charge of relations with the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (OKW), it is possible for Albert to claim, and the narrative to suggest, that 'à Paris, en 42, on peut faire de la collaboration sans s'en apercevoir'.[748]

This almost blind and uncritical following of Doriot by Albert can be seen as due to the representation of the individual from the private rather than public perspective. Chaix presents the donning of the LVF uniform as a simple expedient to please Albert's leader, which would enable him to follow Doriot into the war-zone at the front in Normandy in 1944, thus emphasising Albert's loyalty to both Doriot and his political cause. Indeed, such is his loyalty that it appears at times to affect his judgement (even Doriot at this point accuses him of losing his mind). Despite liaising with the OKW, for example, Albert feels he has nothing to be ashamed of, even though he realises at this point that France will be liberated by the Allies, and feels his family will not be affected, even if Chaix herself directs most of her criticism at Albert for these actions.[749]

Yet despite this lack of judgement (a realistic accusation given the context the novel is set in, but more acute with the benefit of hindsight), Albert is not shown to be an intentionally poor father or family man; merely absent. Although the family follow in the wake of his wartime political career, he always ensures they are housed and their needs are met, although this does not provide the emotional satisfaction they require. When the family moves to Paris in 1943, Albert gives his wife a grand piano, as he knows she enjoys playing. Whilst she initially timidly

[748] *Ibid.*, p. 57.
[749] Gorrara, 'Remembering the Collaborating Father', p. 204.

plays it, it later falls silent, a testament to the silence of their relationship. Additionally, when the war deteriorates in August 1944, Albert wants to take the family with him. However, he later decides to leave alone, a claim apparently based on an altruistic (and a uncharacteristically sensible) motive.

Alice, Marie's mother, can be seen to be complicit in the path Albert follows, however, for her ignorance about events allows Albert a freedom and control over the family's fate that is not questioned or seemingly even considered; this loyalty to Albert can be seen to both mirror and facilitate Albert's loyalty to Doriot. Marie herself questions her mother on this point:

> Tu as peur. Lisse et triste, tu élèves tes enfants à l'abri de l'enfer et tu ne vois rien? Pourtant, tu sais la guerre, dehors. Est-il possible que les fenêtres d'un sixième étage cossu aient remplacé dans ton œil le jardin aquarelle de Lyon et t'aient laissé le même regard? Au chemin des Cerisiers a succédé une avenue Rodin du 16^{e} et tu as la même attente, le même amour, la femme anxieuse et ignorante. Tandis que le monde croule, que sifflent les vols alliés au-dessus de ta tête, tu effleures de tes doigts d'albâtre les touches brillantes de ton instrument de rêve et tu n'entends rien?[750]

Yet despite this accusatory questioning by Marie, it later seems Alice is portrayed as having actually been unaware of the world that surrounded her and that her husband was active in, for after the Liberation she is seen as compensating for what she did not know. With her husband missing, and living in penurious circumstances on the good will of relatives, she finally has to pay for what she never understood, or has chosen not to know: the party's secret service, the Normandy landings, the OKW, the bombings, the torture, the concentration camps: these are all things of which the reader is given to believe she did not know. Within Chaix, as in Jardin

[750] Chaix, *LLC*, p. 98.

and Modiano, the family surrounding the father can be seen as victims who have been sacrificed not only to collaboration, but also to the failed patriarchal order.[751]

A father led astray by fate, and a mother wilfully ignorant of the world around her: these are perhaps the ultimate characterisations which Chaix presents of her parents and their wartime activities. Yet can they be seen as credible? Does her father's representation partly rehabilitate those who chose to collaborate? Although the work can be seen as one that does not condemn or absolve outright, it has a natural bias towards absolution, with a narrative which rarely contextualises events in their wider context - thus allowing for a distortion which, even at that time of writing, would have been problematic, given previous literary representations of the war. Thus the experience of Albert is represented as unfortunate, his prosecution resting partly on the fact that he was one of the few remaining high-ranking PPF figures after the war, and he adapts to this as the reader could almost expect at this point: 'Il s'installe dans la retraitre, moine dans son monastère'.[752] This can be compared with the attitude of Albert's father at this time, represented in a poor light for not financially assisting the family. Whilst this is unsurprising in a novel that is a family testament, such devices, allied with silence, cannot decontextualise the novel to such an extent as to 'rehabilitate' Albert, which contrasts with the fate of Jean Jardin, who, following his return from exile, was discreetly rehabilitated within the corridors of power.

Modiano's Search for the Past

Whilst Jardin and Chaix were both motivated by the search for collaborator fathers, Patrick Modiano's background would initially suggest he was motivated by a

[751] Gorrara, 'Remembering the Collaborating Father', p. 207.
[752] Chaix, *LLC*, p. 220.

different parental search in writing about wartime France. Born on 30 July 1945, Modiano had parents who met in occupied Paris during the war, and had carried out their relationship in a semi-clandestine manner, due to Modiano's mother being a Belgian actress and his father being of Jewish-Italian origin.[753] Modiano's childhood, however, took place in a similar atmosphere to Jardin and Chaix, for he suffered from not only the absence of his father, but also from his actress mother's frequent tours. This in turn brought him closer to his brother, Rudy, who died at the age of ten (and it should be noted that Modiano's works of 1967 to 1982 are dedicated to him). This disappearance marked the end of the author's childhood, and his works are a testament to a recurring nostalgia for this period, with plots which often feature a narrator with an uncertain identity seeking to reconstruct a blurred past by filling the gaps through imagination, a trait shared with both Jardin and Chaix.

Modiano is different from these two authors, however. Whilst Jardin and Chaix are in search of collaborator fathers, Modiano's father was not one, and, as noted, had a partly Jewish background. Thus, Modiano's father leads a clandestine existence during the war, relying on concealed identity and negotiation to survive the war years.[754] In this aspect, Modiano's father can instead be seen to have been in a position in which he was a potential victim of Nazi Germany and those who collaborated with it, a situation which placed him in a very different role to those carried out by the fathers of both Jardin and Chaix. Interestingly, it is Modiano's mother, as an actress working for a German film company, who can be seen to be the parent more closely involved with collaboration. Yet despite the involvement of

[753] Nettelbeck, 'Getting the Story Right' p. 283.
[754] Ibid., p. 283.

his mother with the German film industry, this example of parental participation in collaboration does not motivate him to focus on the mother figure in the his writing.[755]

However, it may be that Modiano's mother's collaboration provides part of the key to understanding both *Les Boulevards de ceinture* and themes present within his wider work. Within *Les Boulevards de ceinture*, the principal character, Alexandre, is in search of his father, attempting to establish a meaningful relationship.[756] Whilst he does this, he watches his father, a Jew, consort with and survive amongst a group of criminal collaborators, not only as a matter of business, but also socially. As Modiano's mother worked as an actress for a German film company in occupied Paris, his imagination of the world she inhabited, and his father's involvement in this, can be seen as a definite inspiration for Alexandre's father in *Les Boulevards de ceinture*. Whilst a mother figure is absent from this paternally driven novel, Modiano's mother's activity can be seen to provide the background in which Modiano places Alexandre's father, and explains Alexandre's desire to take on and understand his parent's compromises and humiliations.[757]

This basis in reality is important, and it is likewise important to acknowledge that *Les Boulevards de ceinture* is a fictionalised biographical search for Modiano's father, under the guise of Alexandre.[758] To achieve this, Alexandre enters his world by process of imagined memory. Whilst this is temporally impossible, Alexandre achieves this through imagination, using this to achieve a memory of the

[755] However in Modiano's more recent work there has been a turning of attention towards the female. See Cooke, *Present Pasts*, p. 64.
[756] Jones, *Journeys of Rememberence*, p. 104.
[757] Nordholt, *Perec, Modiano, Raczymow*, pp.92-93.
[758] Cooke, *Present Pasts*, p. 232.

Occupation (and collaboration), even though it was impossible that he could have actually been present. This can be seen to be motivated by a desire to fill a void in his past, and answer questions about his father's wartime activities. As his father never communicated his story to him, he must himself create a past which will inform him of what occurred. This is important, for Alexandre has to know and understand the father who created him, and where he came from, so that he in turn can understand himself. Indeed, Alexandre takes this need to understand to its extreme, literally seeking to become his father by attempting to assume an identity that matches his father's as closely as possible.[759]

The desire that Modiano (together with Jardin and Chaix) possesses to record the past is a strong one.[760] Whilst not historians in the strictest sense, through the recording of their memories it can be seen that they are creating an imaginary archive which contains many historical glimpses of the Occupation.[761] This desire to create a record which attempts to understand the past is vocalised by Alexandre in *Les Boulevards de ceinture*: 'Je sais bien que le curriculum vitae de ces ombres ne présente pas un grand intérêt, mais si je ne le dressais pas aujourd'hui, personne d'autre ne s'y emploierait. C'est mon devoir, à moi qui les ai connus, de les sortir – ne fût-ce qu'un instant – de la nuit'.[762] It is through desire such as this that the authors attempt to understand the action of their wartime fathers.

Modiano therefore uses the novel to understand and help bring clarity to a murky past. Yet, just like Jardin and Chaix, in attempting to bring this lucidity, he has had

[759] *Ibid*., p. 235.
[760] Morris, *Modiano*, p. 37.
[761] Cooke, *Present Pasts*, p. 239.
[762] Modiano, *BdC*, p. 60.

to construct a past which will allow him to do so. This need also comes from a similar motivation to that of Jardin and Chaix, as he cannot find out the truth of the past from his father, thereby leaving him no alternative but to construct it. This construction means the past is dream-like, and has a haunting quality.[763] That Alexandre is experiencing the past as a dream is directly acknowledged by him, in observations such as 'à partir de ce moment, je sais que je rêve et j'évite les gestes trop brusques pour ne pas me réveiller'.[764] Clearly, Alexandre (and Modiano) is resorting to imagination to create a story. As an author, Modiano does this to a far greater extent than either Jardin or Chaix. Whilst undoubtedly these latter authors rely on imagination, they are writing of a period and places at which they were present. This is something that, for Modiano, is impossible.

This also means Modiano's past has been built from no initial knowledge of the war years. To make up for this memory and experience lacunae, much of the past is therefore appropriated by the author from other sources, through which he gains the ability to re-examine the received ideas, banalities, clichés and stereotypes of the war years.[765] In this, he is extremely meticulous, and it has duly been noted by Morris that Modiano 'has such an incredible grasp of the minutiae of the time that it often does seem as if he is drawing on personal memories of what happened', as indeed Modiano has suggested himself.[766] This therefore gives *Les Boulevards de ceinture* a great sense of authentic detail. In part, this can be ascribed not to Modiano's 'memories' of the war, but to his research on the period, which allows

[763] Cooke, *Present Pasts*, p. 246.
[764] Modiano, *BdC.*, p. 139.
[765] Hamel, *La Bataille des mémoires*, p. 221.
[766] Alan Morris, 'And the "Bande" Played On: An Intertext for Patrick Modiano's *Les Boulevards de ceinture*' in John E. Flower (ed.), *Patrick Modiano* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2007), p. 33.

him to recreate the war years.[767] This can be seen in aspects of *Les Boulevards de ceinture* that Modiano himself has admitted are based in factual elements. For example, he has admitted that the village of Barbizon is the basis for a location in the novel,[768] and as Morris has shown, a 1944 journalistic piece from *Le Figaro* by André Billy provides an important source of inspiration, amongst others.[769] Yet in spite of this, Modiano's representation of the past is not a complete rendering, relying as it does on a 'mythic' quality, used to create a memory-fantasy and capture the atmosphere and moral ambiguity of the period.[770]

However, his creation-discovery of the past creates further problems. As with Jardin and Chaix, once Alexandre finds his father and his father's past, he then has to understand and come to terms with it. Whilst Alexandre has 'discovered' his father, which goes towards solving the predicament of a gap in his past, this in turn leads to a new set of problems, based around the uncomfortable reality of his father's wartime existence amongst collaborators. In the case of Alexandre (as with Modiano), the price of knowing his father is that he has to confront the guilt of parental compromise with collaborators, as well as remembering a France in which the threat of deportation is a very real one.[771] The figure of Alexandre's father is important for memory of the war years since, as a Jew who lives and works with collaborators, within his person lies access to both the culprits and potential victims of collaboration.

---

[767] Claire Gorrara, *French Crime Fiction and the Second World War: Past Crimes, Present Memories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 64.
[768] Morris, 'And the "Bande" Played On', p. 41.
[769] See Morris, 'And the "Bande" Played On' for this argument.
[770] Anne-Marie Obajtek-Kirkwood, 'Une certaine presse de « plumitifs » : celle des Boulevards de ceinture', in John E. Flower (ed.), *Patrick Modiano* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2007), p. 71.
[771] Alan Morris, 'A Child in Time: Patrick Modiano and the Memory of the Occupation', in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European Memories of the Second World War* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999), p. 234.

It is not simply parental compromise that Alexandre has to face, however. He also has to contend with the fact that, morally, his father is supporting the wrong side within the wartime conflict - although as the novel develops this initial judgement, too, is clouded, when it becomes apparent that Alexandre is no 'ingénu' himself.[772] As an author, Modiano is clear in portrayal of Alexandre's father, and illustrates his faults; in this, he can be seen to be different from Chaix, who denies or understates the knowledge her father may have had of the activities of collaborators and occupiers he was involved with, and instead creates an image of a man who was attempting to deal with the situation that fate had dealt him in the only way possible. Instead of attempting to create an identity that lacks credibility, Modiano instead allows far greater access to 'negative' aspects of his father, and wider ambivalent memories of the war.[773] Moreover, Modiano also ensures the reader is aware that not only Alexandre's father, but the characters and situations that he is involved with, are imaginary, which in turn results in readers being unable to believe in the characters for any length of time.[774] Due to this, the reader is allowed far greater freedom to judge the war years by Modiano than is permitted either Jardin or Chaix, and his form of writing allows more flexible judgements to be made.

However, despite this freedom of judgement, it can still be seen that Alexandre has emotionally invested in his father, and therefore fails to discover a complete picture of him. This is partly because Alexandre's father remains a mysterious figure, and

[772] Golsan, *Vichy's Afterlife*, p. 54.
[773] Hamel, *La Bataille des mémoires*, p. 222.
[774] Cooke, *Present Pasts*, p. 238.

despite Alexandre's enquiries about his father's life a response is never received. Alexandre is often led to believe that he will gain an understanding at some point however, for one of his father's favourite phrases is 'je vous expliquerai'.[775] Yet, this evasiveness on his father's part cannot fully explain Alexandre's inability to provide a balanced representation, as filial protectiveness at least in part limits Alexandre, and he admits to attempting to protect his father with a 'vigilance de saint-bernard'.[776] Whilst Alexandre is motivated to shield his father from contemporary wartime surroundings, he is also motivated by his own concerns. By entering his father's world and creating himself in his father's image, he has lain himself open to the suffering of the Occupation.[777] Therefore, in protecting his father he is protecting himself from some of the misery of the period.

Yet, Alexandre can never completely experience the war as his father has, for he has come from, and returns to, throughout the novel, the present. The narration of the novel starts in the present tense, becomes *passé composé*, then moves between the two. Because of these temporal changes, the reader recognises the narrator as someone from the present, with all that implies about a fuller knowledge of many aspects of the war years, such as the Holocaust. Whilst Alexandre's father lives under threat of deportation as a Jew, the full horror of this implication of this can only be grasped from the present. Because of this, it can be seen that Alexandre, as narrator, is in a position of power. 'Que seriez-vous sans moi?' is a question he asks of his father, illustrating the power of his imagination.[778] But this imagination is not that powerful, for Alexandre cannot ultimately escape the reality of the past nor

[775] *Ibid.*, p. 241.
[776] Modiano, *BdC*, p. 120.
[777] Morris, 'A Child in Time', p. 235.
[778] Modiano, *BdC*, p. 120.

ultimately hide such a reality from the reader, and in this he is reminiscent of both Jardin and Chaix.

Conclusion

As noted throughout this thesis, the assumption that within literature memories of collaboration were repressed until the 1970s has been commonly held.[779] As previous chapters have shown, this is far from the case. Within this chapter, works of the *mode rétro* have been discussed. Modiano, whose works have been identified as being a key influence on the *mode rétro*, within *Les Boulevards de ceinture*, provides a story in which Alexandre goes in search of and provides a memory of his father[780]and of the war. This search and discovery, as with Jardin and Chaix, is a metaphor for the *mode rétro*. Through its innovative style, focus on familial memories, and the widespread interest the genre created, the *mode rétro* provided memories of the past which took control as new generation came to the fore in the aftermath of the 1968 riots. However, such a view of the past as was represented by authors such as Chaix, Jardin and Modiano is flawed. For Chaix, her father is a 'profoundly disturbing figure'.[781] Yet, as with other key authors of the *mode rétro*, Chaix has a troubled relationship with the wartime past, and, as with Jardin and Modiano, this troubled relationship does not always permit the truth to be represented. As Atack has noted, the *mode rétro* has a contradictory discourse as much as anything which preceded it, marked by by the intricate interweavings of hero and anti-hero, which 'encapsulate the shifting narratives of memory in the

[779] Sanyal, 'The French War', pp. 92-93.
[780] Kathryn Jones, *Journeys of Rememberence*, p. 107.
[781] Gorrara, 'Remembering the Collaborating Father', p. 208.

postwar period'.[782] By attempting to reach a past that is uncomfortable, and without direct experience of the war, the authors in this chapter can create both the past, and avoid unpalatable truths, in a way that previous authors writing of collaboration did not.

[782] Margaret Atack, '"L'Armée des ombres " and "Le Chagrin et la pitié": Reconfigurations of Law, legalities and the State in Post-1968 France' in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European memories of the Second World War* (Oxford: Berghahn, 1999), pp. 173-174.

Conclusion: Representations of Collaboration

The number of novels written about the Occupation following the end of hostilities in France numbers in the thousands. Each decade since the war has witnessed the release of hundreds of novels, films, essays and memoirs, which together have bound the war years with France's national identity.[783] The FRAME database (one of whose purpose it is to identify novels that have disappeared from historical knowledge) identifies over twelve hundred. Of these, over six hundred were written prior to 1974, with many portraying to a greater or lesser extent some form of collaboration.[784] For example, whilst the novels in chapter three can by no means be described as novels whose primary focus is collaboration, and are not found within the FRAME database when 'collaboration' in used as the keyword in search of all novels, by its very nature collaboration is a recognisable and implicit part of these stories, and therefore comment on their representation is justifiable. As large numbers of people wrote about the war, a substantial proportion of these will have to some extent represented or discussed collaborators and collaboration. Therefore it has been necessary to be highly selective in choosing novels which can be discussed in any sort of profound way.[785] However, where possible, a wider selection of novels has been identified, which have been used to offer wider contrast or comparison with the issues discussed. Moreover, by adopting a more selective approach, it has also meant it has been possible to examine the questions under consideration in greater depth.

---

[783] Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd, 'Introduction', in Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd (eds.) *Framing narratives of the second World War and occupation in France, 1939 – 2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 1.
[784] The database is available at www.frame.leeds.ac.uk.
[785] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, p. 156.

That the period from circa 1944 to circa 1974 was selected to examine how post-war French fictional literary narratives understood and represented collaboration was done so with Henry Rousso's *Le Syndrome de Vichy* specifically in mind. His contention was that, up until circa 1968, there were varying degrees of repression of memories of collaboration, after which such repression failed as the post-1968 generation questioned their parents' past. Indeed, Rousso's examination of the narratives of the political opinion formers of the pre-1968 period appears convincing. Yet novels (as is the case with other forms of cultural media), as has been demonstrated, are also important tools through which the past can be understood. This has been stated by Lloyd, whose work has argued that, when examining writing on the Occupation, distinct generic boundaries that once existed between history, memoir and fiction are no longer rigid.[786] Yet, Rousso's pre-1968 analysis pays little attention to cultural phenomena, focusing instead on the 'gardiens d'une mémoire officielle'.[787] It is only in his post-1968 examination of memory that fictional authors and wider cultural forms receive attention.

The discussion of the works of Modiano and Jardin provide evidence of this.[788] In the sense that such authors (and others of the *mode rétro*) were ground-breaking in their approaches, for example adopting new styles and approaches to questions of genre, and had high profiles against a backdrop of wide public interest in the war years, Rousso is correct to examine them. In literary terms, this has been proven by

[786] Lloyd, *Collaboration and Resistance*, pp. 1 - 11. This approach has also been adopted in the study of other media which can be used to explore the war years. See for example Michel Jacquet, *Travelling sur les années noires: l'Occupation vue par le cinema français depuis 1945* (Paris: Alvik, 2004).
[787] Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, p. 130.
[788] *Ibid*., pp. 149–154.

Alan Morris, who has provided a cultural overview of this phenomenon.[789] Yet, as this thesis has shown, there was a wider-ranging and generally accurate account of collaboration available from popular or high-profile novels which existed not only from before the *mode rétro*, but also from circa 1944 onwards. This makes it possible to state that such fictional narratives do not in fact mirror the account of official state-sponsored repression of memories of collaboration detailed by Rousso in his examination of the political class, or official opinion formers. Such novels should instead be seen as offering wide-ranging representation of collaboration which offered a counter-culture to official Gaullist attempts at repression.

That this claim can be made for the novels discussed can be seen as they are off-set against the periodization of memory Rousso offers. As chapter three points out, the selected novels display collaboration in daily life, with issues such as 'horizontal' collaboration and the black market, for example, readily acknowledged as part the average experience for many French people. Moreover, they offer explanations of the route and motivations by which individuals came to collaboration, in contrast to the official Gaullist memory. Moving beyond collaboration, they are also critical of both the process of *l'épuration* as well as many aspects of the Resistance, particularly those who chose to join the struggle at the last minute. Rousso next shows that, from the beginning of the 1950s, the Gaullist myth was becoming ever more predominant in official life, with the end of wide-ranging legal processes against collaborators, and the beginning of France's post-war economic boom allowing memories of the war to fade away. Representations of intellectual and cultural collaboration, in particular the works of Céline, strongly challenge this

[789] Morris, *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed*.

perception. Whilst official memory may have downplayed French involvement, the authors discussed in chapter four presented an image of individuals intellectually dedicated to collaboration, or at least some parts of it, whilst representations of those also involved in cultural collaboration show their work in media as read, listened to or viewed by large numbers of the French population. Going beyond this stage, the 1960s were a period in which official Gaullist memory began to move towards actively building a new memory of the past which celebrated France as a country which would always resist an invader, with acts of resistance during the war seen a key aspect of this. Novels of military and paramilitary collaboration not only belie this view, but also portray French people who were actively willing to fight for, or support those who fought for, the Germans. Saint-Loup, for example, presents Frenchmen in German uniform, fighting for the Germans against communism on the Eastern Front, whilst Patrick Modiano examines the shady world of the French Gestapo rooting out resistance fighters within France. Such portrayals conflict directly with official memory of France as a nation of resisters.

These chapters therefore offer an historical viewpoint which differs from those outlined by Rousso. This then leaves chapter six as something of an anomaly, examining as it does the *mode rétro* and familial memories of collaboration. Rousso identifies this as a period in which discussion of collaboration is once again part of national discourse, some of which involves cultural phenomena such as Louis Malle's *Lacombe Lucien*, and whose literary manifestations, as noted, have been well charted by Alan Morris. That the 1970s saw a heightened interest in collaboration, and that the literature of the period had its own style and attitudes, is not contested. However, the key point is that such works followed on from an

existing and widespread literature which freely discussed collaboration during the Occupation to which they can be compared as well as contrasted. Michel Jacquet has seen that the purpose of the novels on the Occupation written between 1945 and 1969 was to provide a demystifying and cathartic experience to their readers.[790] In terms of collaboration, it would also seem they often sought to offer an historically realistic and believable representation both of collaboration and the individuals and groups involved.

To claim such novels offer an historically realistic and believable representation of collaboration as a statement in itself has to be justified. Can it be stated that these novels complement current historians' accounts of collaboration, which offer a far more nuanced and rational view of the war? It should of course be noted that history is constantly re-written, and that, consequently, it is possible for our understanding of the past to change as historiography develops, as the example of Robert Aron's *Histoire de Vichy* shows. With this in mind, and considering literary representations, William Cloonan has noted that, whilst 'all sources of information remain deeply suspect, the novel continues to function as a valued repository of insight and intelligence'.[791] Cloonan makes a valid point, but judging from the representations contained within this thesis, one should not unduly trouble the historian of collaboration: any reader of the novels considered would be largely unsurprised by the representation of collaborators and collaboration available in current academic and 'popular' historical works. Whilst comparisons have been made to historical works throughout, it is worth contrasting briefly the

[790] Michel Jacquet, *Une Occupation très Romanesque: ironie et dérision dans le roman français de 1945 à nos jours* (Paris: La Bruyère, 2000), pp. 7, 16.
[791] Cloonan, *The Writing of War*, p. 161.

representations of collaboration studied with the conclusions of one serious general work on occupied France: Richard Vinan's *The Unfree French*.

Vinen's first and simplest conclusion is that, for most people under the Occupation, 'life was miserable'.[792] Even if not directly targeted, lack of food, the threat of German violence or even displacement (about one in five Frenchmen were in Germany at some point during the war, many working for the Germans in the STO) were ever-present threats, even if suffering was not equal, and although wealth could help mitigate such issues, this was also by no means a guarantee. People on the whole were therefore constrained in their actions, and often chose a course in life that would be least horrible, even if this meant collaborating and working with Vichy or the Germans, either through simple fear or the dread of losing what they already had. This quite clearly made freedom of choice difficult. But the concept of 'freedom of choice' is in itself problematic: at the Liberation, many were condemned for 'volunteering' to work or fight for the Germans. In reality, their freedom of choice was limited by poverty, isolation or lack of information, which, to a greater or lesser extent, could often lead to some form of either actual or perceived collaboration. This lack of actual freedom of choice was further complicated by the difficult question of where authority actually stemmed from. For example, Germans based in Paris worked with collaborationists, often against the aims of the German-sanctioned Vichy regime. Within the Vichy regime, there were those who were avowed supporters of Pétain, and those who supported the more collaborationist Laval. This was just the national picture however. At a more local level, both family and community were important in influencing what

[792] Vinen, *The Unfree French*, pp. 367 – 376.

decisions people made and what actions they took. Beyond this, what people believed, rather than the objective truth, was vitally important. A lack of information, coupled with German and Vichy propaganda, made making rational choices based on any form of reality often difficult.

Vinen is, of course, concluding a work on the everyday unfree French, and the above general conclusion overlooks examples of those who would collaborate for criminal or simply evil reasons, as can be found in the works of Tournier of Modiano. However, he does describe a situation which is readily recognisable to anyone who has read the novels contained in this thesis. Indeed, the reader would only need to sample one or two to gain a ready insight into the world Vinen portrays. To take an example, Marcel Aymé's *Chemin des ecoliers*, examining as it does the 'physical, moral and psychological pressures experienced by the average Frenchman and his reaction to them',[793] displays to a greater or lesser degree many of the facets of life under occupation and collaboration which Vinen describes. Although the lives Aymé portrays are by no means all 'miserable', overall the novel conveys a sense of drudgery and unease. Both lack of food and the benefits of wealth are important themes within the novel, as is concern about what form interaction with the occupying forces should take: Charles Michaud and his son Antoine display very different attitudes in their interactions with the Germans, with Charles far more concerned about how social actions may be interpreted compared with Antoine. Together, they illustrate the difficulty of knowing what choices to make under the Occupation, and how far relations with the Germans could go before they constituted collaboration. Antoine's black-market activities, alongside

[793] Lord, *Marcel Aymé*, p. 75.

his socialising with the occupier, are eventually curtailed. However, it is possible to conceive that had this not been the case, his involvement with the Germans might well have increased, illustrating the dangers of ill-considered choices leading to possible charges of collaboration.

Aymé presents a realistic picture of the Occupation within *Le Chemin des ecoliers*. Given this was published in 1946, in the immediate aftermath of the war, this begs the question of what developments in social and moral attitudes are represented within the novels studied over the period, and to what extent literary styles either imitated, or innovated on, previous literary works which examined collaboration (although it must be empasised that, to any seemingly definitive statement, exceptions can always be found). Many of the novels studied within this thesis retain traditional linear narratives and styles. Into this broad category can be placed *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, *Le Chemin des écoliers*, *Les Forêts de la nuit*, *Au Bon Beurre* and *Les Hérétiques*. These all date from the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s however. However, far less traditional in style are the novels of Céline, Modiano and Tournier. These, written in the 1960s and 1970s, can be said to have dream-like qualities, together with non-linear narratives, which offer a blurred vision of the past which nevertheless captures essential truths of France's collaborating past. Linked, but in a clear category of their own given their personal quest to 'discover' their fathers' past, are the works of Chaix and Jardin. Both have multiple narrative viewpoints which are used to create a fictive memoir with which to understand their familial past. These, like those of the previous category, capture the past, with many suppositions and the distinct use of anachronistic knowledge, which is deployed by the writers from their post-war standpoint in their attempts to uncover

their heritage. In this, they are reminiscent of Céline's work, and the influence of Céline on Modiano has already been highlighted.[794] Certainly, stylistically, Céline's work marks a major departure in the style of representations of collaboration and collaborators, with a debt owed by those authors who followed; as Marie Hartmann has pointed out, Céline fundamentally challenged the representation of the individual in history.[795] Céline's work can therefore be seen as a direct precursor to the *mode rétro*. Yet, vitally importantly, although new ways were found to characterise collaborators and collaboration, their representation in high-profile novels itself was not new, as this thesis has discussed, in that they provided an active counter-culture to the Gaullist political narrative described by Rousso. Collaboration is shown by many of the authors to be complex, with ambiguity an important factor in many people's lives and the situations they faced.

Despite this wide-ranging representation, however, conclusions can also be drawn from aspects of collaboration that are not represented in fictional narratives during the period, but which subsequent historical study has identified as being important elements of collaboration. Discussion of the Holocaust is one of the most unmentionable subjects, although primarily it is French complicity that is considered most taboo. Many novels contain Jewish characters who are fearful of, or suffer deportation, but a direct link to French collaboration or collaborators is seldom made, nor does such an eventuality provide the primary plotline of any of the novels, with the Germans instead being seen as primarily responsible. However, anti-Semitism is not wholly ignored, nor some form of passive French complicity.

[794] Morris, *Modiano*, p. 18, p. 20.
[795] Marie Hartmann, *L'Envers de l'Histoire contemporaine: Étude de la «trilogie allemande» de Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (Paris: Société d'études céliniennes, 2006), p. 240.

Aymé's Jewish character, Lina, is treated as eccentrically and neurotically worried about the Holocaust by others in *Le Chemin des écoliers*, which would have appeared all too reasonable in the post-war world, and this is typical of the casual anti-Semitism that the novels portray, even if direct French involvement is ignored. In this, novels can be seen to mirror a desire to suppress explicit recognition of French involvement in the Holocaust evident in other cultural forms. Alain Resnais' 1956 short documentary film *Nuit et brouillard*, which examined the Holocaust, was altered so that French involvement would be hidden. Resnais was forced to remove an offending gendarme's képi in a scene which showed the transit camp at Pithiviers. This camp was set up by the Germans, but was administered by the French.

Moreover, the subject of the Holocaust remained a difficult subject for later writers such as Jardin, who clearly struggled with his father's involvement with Laval, who allowed Jews to be deported to the death camps. This too points to another notable area in which collaboration is not analysed: the civil service. Until Jardin's fictive memoir, Jean Jardin was largely a forgotten figure, who even at the time of his influence few would have heard of. It can be speculated that little work was undertaken on this subject due to the continuing influence within the civil service of those who collaborated. However, given their low profile, and the seemingly mundane nature of their work, it is equally true that novelists saw little attraction or fictive scope in presenting the activities of state functionaries, even if the reality of the lives of individuals such as Jean Jardin or Maurice Papon would now suggest them as suitable subjects. Whilst it could be argued that representations of daily life were also mundane, novels on this subject provided evocations which the majority

of the population could relate to. This was not the case with the civil service, which it can be postulated would have appeared uninteresting and unimportant.

The second clear taboo is *collaboration horizontale*. As with complicity in the Holocaust however, those judged guilty of this collaboration were not absent from novels, but were once again not the primary focus. Where they do feature, they are shown to be vain and shallow individuals, such as Denise in *Mon Village à l'heure allemande*, and, as in the case of Denise, often come to an unfortunate end. Within the wider cultural sphere, Marguerite Duras's screenplay for *Hiroshima mon amour* naturally stands out against this trend, providing as it does a sympathetic and touching representation of a woman who had her head shaved as punishment for her romantic relationship with a German soldier, although it should be noted that, whilst Duras's character is simply in love with a German soldier, she is not actively involved in material or ideological collaboration. However, despite the success of the film, the problematic nature of such subject matter was shown by its exclusion from the official selection at the 1959 Cannes Film Festival.[796] Whilst the uninteresting nature of the civil service, as suggested above, could explain why novels on such a subject had not appeared, no such reasoning can be claimed for romantic or sexual activity. What seems more likely is that women's history (and particularly those involved with collaboration) suffered from the more general devalorisation of women in post-war France, and in which the head shearings carried out at the Liberation played a vital part in exorcising threatened masculinity and in restoring traditional familial and societal hierarchy.[797]

---

[796] Remi Fournier Lanzoni, *French Cinema: From Its Beginnings to the Present*, (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2004), p. 229.
[797] Laurens, 'La Femme au Turban', pp. 176-177.

As Richard Vinen has pointed out, in recent times, discussion of the war years has focused on groups who suffered most under the Occupation: Jews who were deported and killed, Resistance fighters who risked torture and death, gypsies who were interned, and women who suffered from abuse and shearings at the Liberation.[798] Whilst the fate of gypsies remains a little-discussed subject even today,[799] and Resistance fighters are not a primary focus of narratives of collaboration, both the Jews and women were the focus of subjects which were taboo within novels during the majority of the period considered by this thesis. That the French would seek to deny or negate involvement in the Holocaust is easily understandable: even amidst the horror and destruction of the war years in France, the Holocaust, by its scale, stands out as one of the worst crimes against humanity. To admit active involvement in this was a step too far for the novelists of the period. The situation of women within novels can be ascribed to a desire to return to a patriarchal society. Not only was the importance of the female role negated in the post-war years, but the female 'collaboration' of the war years was seen as shameful and representative of France giving herself willingly to the German occupiers.

---

[798] Vinen, *The Unfree French*, p. 367. In literary terms, there has also been representation of those causing suffering, with the high-profile publication and discussion of Jonathan Littell's *Les Bienveillantes* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006), which won the Prix Goncourt and Grand Prix du roman de l'Académie française in 2006. The novel is narrated by the fictional Alsatian Maximilien Aue, a former SS officer who takes part in the Holocaust, and is essentially the memoirs of a former Nazi mass-murderer. The novel has been praised for its historical accuracy, by among others Pierre Nora (see Jonathan Littell and Pierre Nora, "Conversation sur l'histoire et le roman", *Le Débat* 2007 (144), p. 25). Littell's work not only shows the continued interest which fictive representations of the Second World War have generated beyond the timeframe of this thesis, but also that they continue to operate as sources by which the past can be understood.

[799] For one of the few works which details French involvement in persecution of the gypsies, see Denis Peschanski, *Les tsiganes en France: 1939-1946* (Paris: Poche, 2010). The only novel contained within the FRAME database which focuses on gypsy experience is: Kkrist Mirror, *Tsiganes: 1940-1945, le camp de concentration de Montreuil-Bellay* (Paris: Emmanuel Proust, 2008).

Both of these areas of France's past can be seen to be explored more openly during and after the period of the *mode rétro*, indicating as has been suggested that in terms of a renewed interest, differing literary styles, and in examining previously largely unexplored areas the *mode rétro* did indeed mark a change in France's relationship with its wartime past. Importantly, however, beyond these key areas, and as this thesis has discussed, literary representations provide a record of collaboration that is far more open and accurate than Rousso's analysis of the political narrative would allow. Rousso's metaphor of sickness and obsession, together with ideas related to this, does not fit the image of collaborators and collaboration contained in the fictional narratives discussed, which instead provide a more historically accurate understanding of collaboration than the advocates of such metaphors would suggest.

Bibliography

Place, publisher and year of publication of copy consulted are given where possible.

Primary sources (novels)

If a re-printed version has been consulted, the year of original publication has also been given in square brackets.

Arnold, Boris, *Les Amours dissidentes* (Paris: Prima-Union, 1956).
Aymé, Marcel, *Le Chemin des écoliers* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972 [1946]).
—— *La Jument verte* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972 [1933]).
—— *Uranus* (Paris: Gallimard, 1980 [1948]).
—— *Le Vin de Paris* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947).
Barjavel, René, *Le Voyageur imprudent* (Paris: Denoël, 1944).
Beck, Béatrix, *Léon Morin prêtre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).
Binet, Laurent, *HHhH* (Paris: Grasset, 2010).
Boisdeffre, Pierre de, *Les Fins dernières* (Paris: Broche, 1973).
Bory, Jean-Louis, *Mon Village à l'heure allemande* (Paris: J'ai Lu, 1967 [1945]).
—— *La Sourde Oreille* (Paris: Julliard, 1958).
Bourrette, Marcel, *Tout renaîtra* (La Tronche-Montfleury (Isère): Cahiers de l'Alpe, 1959).
Boussinot, Roger, *Aérodrome* (Paris: Français Réunis, 1954).
—— *Les Guichets du Louvre* (Paris: Denoël, 1960).
Bove, Emmanuel, *Le Piège* (Paris: Gallimard, 1986 [1945]).
Brasillach, Robert, *Six heures à perdre* (Paris: Plon, 1953).
Breitman, Michel, *Fortunat ou le père adopté* (Paris: Denoël, 1955).
Brenner, Jacques, *L'Atelier du photographe* (Paris: Julliard, 1954).
Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, *D'un Château l'autre* (Paris, Gallimard, 1957).
—— *L'Ecole des cadavres* (Paris: Denoël, 1938).
—— *Guignol's band, tomes 1 et 2* (Paris: Gallimard, 1989 [1944]).
—— *Nord* (Paris: Gallimard, 1960).
—— *Rigadon* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969).
Chaix, Marie, *Les Lauriers du Lac de Constance* (Paris: Seuil, 1974).
Chamson, André, *Le Puits des miracles* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945).
Châteaubriant**,** Alphonse de, *La Gerbe des forces* (Paris: Grasset, 1937).
Chevallier, Simone, *La Première Pierre* (Paris: Pierre Horay, 1958).
Croussy, Guy, *La Tondue* (Paris: Le Livre de poche, 1980).
Curtis, Jean-Louis, *Les Forêts de la nuit* (Paris: J'ai Lu, 1979 [1947]).
Dard, Frédéric, *Batailles sur la route* (Saint-Etienne: Dumas, 1949).
—— *La Crève* (Lyon: Confluences, 1946).
Duhamel, Georges, *Cri des profondeurs* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1951).
Duras, Marguerite, *La douleur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1993 [1985]).
—— *Hiroshima mon amour* (Paris: Gallimard, 1961).
Dutourd, Jean, *Au Bon Beurre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).
Edmond-About, Noële, *Turne 3* (Paris: Sociales Françaises, 1945).
Forrester, Viviane, *Ainsi des exilés* (Paris: Denoël, 1970).
Fréville, Jean, *Les Collabos* (Paris: Flammarion, 1946).
Gandebeuf, Jacques, *L'Accent de mon père* (Metz: Serpenoise, 2002).

Genet, Jean, *Pompes funèbres* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978 [1948]).
Goby, Valentine, *L'Echappée* (Paris: Gallimard, 2007).
Haenel, Yannick , *Jan Karski* (Paris: Galliamrd, 2009).
Harris, Robert, *Fatherland*, trans. Hubert Galle**,** (Paris: Pocket, 1996).
Héléna, André, *Les Salauds ont la vie dure* (Paris: E-dite, 2011 [1949]).
Hivert, Madeleine, *L'Ouragan* (Paris: Conquistador, 1952).
Ikor, Roger, *A travers nos déserts* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1950).
Jamet, Claude*, Fifi roi* (Paris: l'Élan, 1947).
Jamet, Dominique, *Un Traître* (Paris: Flammarion, 2008).
Jardin, Alexandre, *Le Zubial* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997).
Jardin, Pascal, *La Bête à bon Dieu* (Paris: Livre de poche, 1980).
—— *La Guerre à neuf ans* (Paris: Grasset, 1989 [1971]).
—— *Guerre après guerre* (Paris: Grasset, 1995 [1973]).
—— *Le Nain jaune* (Paris: Julliard, 1978).
Joffo, Joseph, *Un Sac de billes* (Paris: Jean-Claude Lattès, 1973).
Langfus, Anna, *Le Sel et le soufre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1960).
Laurent, Jacques, *Le Petit Canard* (Paris: Grasset, 1954).
Littell, Jonathan, *Les Bienveillantes* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006).
Luchaire, Corinne, *Ma drôle de vie* (Paris: Sun, 1949).
Magnan, Jean-Marie, *Deux Fois dans le même fleuve* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1971).
—— *A en mourir* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1973).
Merle, Robert, *La Mort est mon métier* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).
Mit, Serge, *Carcasse à vendre* (Paris: Dominique Wapler, 1950).
Modiano, Patrick, *Les Boulevards de ceinture* (Paris: Gallimard, 1983 [1972]).
—— *La Ronde de nuit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969).
Moore, Brian, *The Statement* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011 [2003]).
Némirovsky, Irène, *Suite française* (Paris: Denoël, 2004).
Nimier, Roger, *Les Épées* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948).
Nourissier, François, *Allemande* (Paris: Grasset, 1973).
Pannequin, Roger, *Ami si tu tombes* (Paris: Le Sagittaire, 1976).
Perret, Jacques, *Bande à part* (Paris: Gallimard, 1951).
Peyrefitte, Roger, *La Fin des ambassades* (Paris: Flammarion, 1953).
Saint-Loup, *Les Hérétiques* (Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1965).
—— *Les Nostalgiques* (Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1967).
—— *Les Volontaires* (Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1963).
Sajer, Guy, *Le Soldat oublié* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1967).
Sartre, Jean-Paul, *La P... respectueuse, suivi de Morts sans sépulture* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972 [1946]).
Simenon, Georges, *Le Clan des Ostendais* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947).
Siniac, Pierre, *L'Unijambiste de la cote 284* (Paris: Gallimard, 1980).
Tournier, Michel, *Le Roi des aulnes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970).
Vailland, Roger*, Drôle de jeu* (Paris: Livre de poche, 1968 [1945]).

Films

Clouzot, Henri-Georges (dir.), *Manon* (1949).
Malle, Louis (dir.), *Lacombe Lucien* (1974).
Melville, Jean-Pierre (dir.), *Léon Morin prêtre* (1961).
Norman, Jewison (dir.), *The Statement* (2004).
Ophüls, Marcel (dir.), *Le Chagrin et la pitié* (1969).

Resnais, Alain (dir.), *Hiroshima mon amour* (1959).

Unprinted secondary sources

Austin, Roger, 'The Educational and Youth Policies of the Vichy Government in the Department of Hérault, 1940-1944' (Ph.D., University of Manchester, 1981).

Printed secondary sources

Abetz, Otto, *D'Une Prison: précédé du procès Abetz vu par Jean Bernard-Derosne. Suivi des principales dépositions, du réquisitoire et de la plaidoirie de Me René Floriot* (Paris: Amiot Dumont, 1949).
Adler, Laure, *Marguerite Duras* (Paris: Gallimard, 1998).
Alary, Eric, *Les Français au quotidien 1939-1949* (Paris: Perrin, 2006).
Alméras, Philippe, *Céline. Entre haines et passions* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1994).
Amouroux, Henri, *La grande histoire des Français sous l'occupation*, 8 vols. (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1976-85).
Angelelli, Jean-Paul, 'La France de 1940 à 1945 à travers les romans de Marcel Aymé', in Yves-Alain Favre and Michel Lecureur (eds.), *Colloque Marcel Aymé et son temps* (Paris: Jours de France, 1984).
Ankersmit, F. R., 'Historiography and Postmodernism', *History and Theory* 28 (1989), 137-153.
Aron, Robert, *Histoire de Vichy 1940-1944* (Paris: Fayard, 1954).
Assouline, Pierre, *Une Éminence grise: Jean Jardin (1904-1976)* (Saint-Armand (Cher): Balland, 1986).
—— *L'Épuration des intellectuels* (Bruxelles: Complexe, 1990).
Atack, Margaret, *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural politics and narrative forms, 1940-1950* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989).
—— *May '68 in French Fiction and Film: Rethinking Society, Rethinking Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
—— 'Representing the Occupation in the Novel of the 1950s: *Ne jugez pas*', *Cincinnati Romance Review* 29 (2010), 76-88.
—— **'**Sins, crimes and guilty passions in France's stories of war and occupation', *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 1 (2007), 79-90.
Aymé, Marcel, *Écrits sur la Politique (1933-1967)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres/Archimbaud, 2003).
Azéma, Jean-Pierre, *La Collaboration (1940-1944)*, (Paris: Seuil, 1975).
—— 'La Milice', *Vingtième siècle, revue d'histoire* 28 (1990), 83-106.
—— *De Munich à la Libération: 1938-1944*, (Paris: Seuil, 1979).
—— and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992).
—— and Olivier Wieviorka, *Vichy, 1940-1944* (Paris: Perrin, 2004).
Bachelier, Christian, 'L'Arnée', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.) *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992).
Baldwin, Peter, 'The "Historikerstreit" in Context' in Peter Baldwin (ed.) *Reworking the Past* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1990).
Balzarro, Anna, *Le Vercors et la zone libre de l'Alto Tortonese – Récits, mémoire, histoire* (Paris: Harmattan, 2003).
Baudot, Marcel, *L'Opinion publique sous l'occupation: L'exemple d'un*

département français (1939-1945) (Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1960).
Beaujour, Michel, and Dominique de Roux (eds.), *Les Cahiers de L'Herne: Louis-Ferdinand Céline II* (Paris: Diffusion, 1965).
Beevor, Antony and Artemis Cooper, *Paris after the Liberation 1944-1949* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1994).
Berg, Christopher S. van der, 'Deliberative Oratory in the 'Annals' and the 'Dialogues', in Victoria Emma Pagán (ed.) *A Companion to Tacitus* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).
Bergeron, Francis, *Saint-Loup* (Grez-sur-Loing: Pardès, 2010).
Berkvam, Michael L., *Writing the Story of France in World War II: Literature and Memory 1942-1958* (New Orleans, LA: University Press of the South, 2000).
Berlière, Jean-Marc, *Policiers français sous l'Occupation: D'après les archives de l'épuration* (Paris: Perrin, 2009).
Beynon John, S., 'The Ambiguous Invader: Images of the German in some French Fiction about the Occupation of 1940-44', *Journal of European Studies* 16 (1986), 187–200.
Bishop, Chris, *Hitler's Foreign Divisions: Foreign Volunteers in the Waffen-SS, 1940–1945* (Staplehurst: Spellmount, 2005).
Bonnett, Maurice, *Christian de la Mazière: La dernière chevauchée du Cavalier Soleil* (Paris: Dualpha, 2011).
Boudon, Jacques-Olivier, *Les Catholiques dans la guerre 1939-1945: Entre Vichy et la Résistance* (Paris: Hachette, 1998).
Boulanger, Gérard, *Maurice Papon: un technocrate français dans la collaboration* (Paris: Seuil, 1998).
Bouloumié, Arlette, *Michel Tournier: le roman mythologique suivi de questions à Michel Tournier* (Paris: José Corti, 1988).
Bourderon, Roger, 'Le Regime de Vichy etait-il Fasciste? Essai d'approche de la question', *Revue d'histoire de la deuxieme guerre mondiale* 91 (1973), 23–45.
Bourdrel, Philippe, *L'Épuration sauvage, 1944-45* (Paris: Perrin, 2008).
Bowles, Brett, 'German newsreel propaganda in France, 1940–1944', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 24 (2004), 45–67.
Braganca, Manuel, 'Le 'bon Allemand' dans le roman français de l'immédiat après-Seconde Guerre mondiale: une erreur de casting?' *Modern & Contemporary France* 18 (2010), 329–342.
—— 'Le Survivant de la Shoah face au texte de fiction: Un écran protecteur ou un écran projecteur? L'exemple d'Anna Langfus', *French Cultural Studies* 23 (2012), 79–90.
Brockmeier, Jens and Rom Harré, 'Narrative Problems and the Promises of an Alternative Paradigm' in Jens Brockmeier and Donal Carbaugh (eds.), *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture* (Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2001).
Brossat, Alain, *Les tondues : un carnaval moche* (Levallois-Perret: Manya, 1992).
Brosman, Catherine Savage, *Visions of France: Fiction, Art, Ideology* (Baton Rouge, LA: Lousiana State University Press, 1999).
Brunet, Jean-Paul, *Jacques Doriot* (Paris: Balland, 1986).
Buckley, William (ed.), *Critical Essays on Louis-Ferdinand Céline*, (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1988).
Buisson, Patrick, *1940-1945, années érotiques: Vichy ou les infortunes de la vertu*

(Paris: Albin Michel, 2008).
Bullard, Alice, *Exile to Paradise: Savagery and Civilization in Paris and the South Pacific*, *1790-1900* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).
Burns, Robert M., *Historiography: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies* (London: Routledge, 2006).
Burrin, Philippe, *La France à l'heure allemand – 1940-44* (Paris: Seuil, 1995).
Burrow, John, *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008).
Buton, Philippe, 'Occupation, Liberation and Purge' in Andrew Knapp (ed.), *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation 1944-47* (New York: Palgrave, 2007).
Cairns, Lucille, *Post-War Jewish Women's Writing in French* (London: Legenda, 2011).
Calin, Françoise, *Les Marques de l'Histoire (1939-1944) dans le roman Français* (Paris: Minard, 2004).
Callil, Carmen, *Bad Faith. A Forgotten History of Family and Fatherland* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2006)
Capdevila, Luc, *Les Bretons au lendemain de l'occupation* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 1999).
Carrard, Philippe, *The French who Fought for Hitler: Memories from the Outcasts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
—— 'From the Outcasts' Point of View: The Memoirs of the French Who Fought for Hitler', *French Historical Studies* 31 (2008), 477–503.
—— 'Narrative and Historiography: Writing the France of the Occupation'. Available at: http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Narrative+and+Historiography%3A+Writing+the+France+of+the+Occupation.-a068279074. Accessed 18 March 2013.
Carroll, Noël, 'Interpretation, History and Narrative', *The Monist* 73 (1990), 134-166.
Caruth, Cathy, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1996).
Castañeda, Hector-Neri, 'Fiction and Reality: Their Fundamental Connections; An Essay on the Ontology of Total Experience', *Poetics* 8 (1979), 31-62.
Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, *Cahiers Céline 3, Céline et l'actualité littéraire*, Jean-Pierre Dauphin and Henri Godard (eds.) (Paris: Gallimard, 1976).
Cellier-Gelly, *André Chamson (1900 – 1983)* (Paris: Perrin, 2001).
Chadwick, Kay, *Alphonse de Châteaubriant: Catholic collaborator* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2002).
—— *Au Bon Beurre: Scenes de la vie sous l'Occupation* (Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Publications, 2003).
Christofferson, Thomas R., and Michael S. Christofferson, *France During World War II: From Defeat to Liberation* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2006).
Cima, *Patrick Modiano: La Ronde de nuit* (Paris: Ellipses, 2000).
Clézio, J. M. G. Le, 'On ne peut pas ne pas lire Céline' in Jean Pierre Dauphin (ed.), *Les critiques de notre temps et Céline* (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1976).
Cloonan, William, *Michel Tournier* (Boston, MA: Twayne, 1985).
—— *The Writing of War: French and German Fiction during World War II* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1999).

Cobb, Richard, *French and Germans, Germans and French: a personal interpretation of France under two occupations, 1914-1918 and 1940-1944* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1983).
Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1961).
Cointet, Jean-Paul, *Expier Vichy: L'épuration en France 1943-1958* (Paris: Perrin, 2008).
—— *Pierre Laval* (Paris: Fayard, 1993).
Cone, Michèle C., *Artists Under Vichy: A Case of Prejudice and Persecution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
Cooke, Dervila, *Present Pasts – Patrick Modiano's (Auto)Biographical Fictions* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005).
Corcy-Debray, Stéphanie, *Jérôme Carcopino, un historien à Vichy* (Paris: Harmattan, 2001).
Cowens, Jon, 'Visions of the Postwar: The Politics of Memory and Expectation in 1940s France', *History and Memory* 10 (1998), 68-101.
Crane, Richard Francis, 'La Croix and the Swastika: The Ambiguities of Catholic Responses to the Fall of France', *Catholic Historical Review* 90 (2004), 45–66.
Curtis, Michael, *Verdict on Vichy – Power and Prejudice in the Vichy France Regime* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002).
Danto, Arthur C., *Narration and Knowledge*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
D'Aragon, Charles, *La Résistance sans héroïsme*, (Paris: Seuil, 1977).
Dauphin, Jean-Pierre (ed.), *Les critiques de notre temps et Céline* (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1976).
Davies, Norman, *Europe at War 1939-1945: No Simple Victory* (London, Macmillan, 2006).
Davis, Colin, *Michel Tournier: Philosophy and Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).
Delarue, Jacques, *Trafics et crimes sous l'Occupation* (Paris: Broché, 1988).
Delperrié de Bayac, Jacques, *Histoire de la milice 1918–1945* (Paris, Fayard, 1994).
Diamond, Hanna, *Fleeing Hitler: France 1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
—— 'A New Dawn? French Women and the Liberation', *Women's Studies International Forum* 23 (2000), 729-738.
—— *Women and the Second World War in France 1939–1948: Choices and Constraints* (Harlow: Longman, 1999).
Drieu la Rochelle, Pierre, *Journal, 1939-45* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992).
Dufresnoy, Philippe, 'La Guerre dans l'œuvre de Marcel Aymé', in Yves-Alain Favre and Michel Lecureur (eds.), *Colloque Marcel Aymé et son temps* (Paris: Jours de France, 1984).
Dorléac, Laurence Bertrand, *L'art de la défaite, 1940-1944* (Paris: Seuil, 1993).
Douzou, Laurent, *La Résistance française: une histoire périlleuse* (Paris: Seuil, 2005).
Dumoulin, Olivier, *Marc Bloch* (Paris: Sciences Po, 2000).
Duras, Marguerite, *Hiroshima mon amour* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972).
Dutourd, Jean, *Les taxis de la Marne* (Paris: Livre de poche, 1963).
Edwards, Rachel, *Myth and the Fiction of Michel Tournier and Patrick Grainville*

(Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 1999).
Evans, Jane E., 'The Soldier in French Literature of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries', 2009, available at http://works.bepress.com/jane_evans/7 (accessed 18 March 2013).
Evans, Richard J., *In Defence of History* (London: Granta, 2000).
—— *Lying about Hitler: history, Holocaust, and the David Irving trial* (New York: Basic Books, 2001).
Farmer, Sarah, *Martyred Village: Commemorating the 1944 Massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane* (Berkeley, CA: University Of California Press, 2000).
Fenby, Jonathan, *The General: Charles de Gaulle and the France he Saved* (London: Simon and Schuster, 2010).
Ferro, Marc, 'Maréchal, nous sommes toujours là', *La Quinzaine littéraire*, 16 February 1973.
—— *Pétain* (Paris: Fayard, 1993).
Flonneau, Marie, 'L'évolution de l'opinion publique de 1940 à 1944', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992).
Fogg, Shannon L., *The Politics of Everyday Life in Vichy France: Foreigners, Undesirables, and Strangers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
Fogu, Claudio, and Wulf Kansteiner, 'The Politics of Memory and the Poetics of History' in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
Forrester, Viviane, *Ce soir, après la guerre* (Paris: Fayard, 1997).
Fouilloux, Étienne, 'Le Clergé', in Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (eds.), *Vichy et les Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1992).
Fourny, Jean François, 'La ligne de démarcation', *L'Esprit créateur* 33 (1993), 53–62.
Fourastié, Jean, *Les Trente Glorieuses ou la révolution invisible de 1946 à 1975* (Paris, Hachette, 2004).
FRAME database. Available at: http://www.frame.leeds.ac.uk/database/
Freeman, Mark, *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative* (London: Routledge, 1993).
Froment, Pascale, *René Bousquet* (Paris: Fayard, 2001).
Galster, Ingrid, *Sartre, Vichy et les intellectuels* (Paris: Harmattan 2001).
Gandillac, Maurice de, 'De quelques mythes germaniques', in Arlette Bouloumié and Maurice de Gandillac (eds.), *Images et signes de Michel Tournier: actes du colloque de Cerisy* (Paris: Gaillmard, 1990).
Garcia, Daniel, *Jean-Louis Bory, 1919-1979* (Paris: Flammarion, 1979).
Gascoigne, David, *Michel Tournier* (Oxford: Berg, 1996).
Gaulle, Charles de, *Mémoires de guerre: L'unité - 1942–1944* (Paris: Plon, 1956).
Gaultier, Léon *Siegfried et le berrichon: parcours d'un collabo* (Paris: Perrin, 1992).
Gedi, Noa, and Yigal Elam, 'Collective Memory – What Is It?', *History and Memory* 8 (1996), 30-50.
Gibault, François, *Céline, 2: 1932-1944 : Délires et persécutions* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1985).
—— *Céline, 3: 1944-1961: Cavalier de l'Apocalypse* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1981).
Gidel, Henry, *Les Deux Guitry* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995).

Gildea, Robert, *Marianne in Chains – In Search of the German Occupation* (London: Macmillan, 2002).
—— 'The Resistance Myth, the Pétainist Myth and Other Voices', in Debra Kelly (ed.), *Remembering and Representing the Experience of War in Twentieth-Century France: Committing to Memory* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2000).
Giolitto, Pierre, *Histoire de la milice* (Paris: Perrin, 1997).
—— *Volontaires Français sou l'uniforme Allemand* (Paris: Perrin, 1999).
Godard, Henri, *Céline scandale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994).
Gofman, Patrick, *Jean Dutourd* (Monaco, Rocher, 1994).
Golsan, Richard J., 'Collaboration and Context: Lacombe Lucien, the Mode Rétro, and the Vichy Syndrome', in Steven Ungar and Tom Conley (eds.) *Identity Papers: Contested Nationhood in Twentieth-Century France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).
—— 'The Legacy of World War II in France: Mapping the Discourses of Memory', in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
—— (ed.) *Memory, the Holocaust, and French Justice – The Bousquet and Touvier Affairs* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996).
—— *Vichy's Afterlife – History and Counterhistory in Postwar France* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2000).
Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas, *The Occult Roots of Nazism: Secret Aryan Cults and Their Influence on Nazi Ideology* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co, 2003).
Gordon, Bertram M., *Collaborationism in France during World War Two* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980).
—— *Historical Dictionary of World War II France: The Occupation, Vichy, and the Resistance, 1938-1946* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998).
—— 'The Morphology of the collaborator: the French Case', *The Journal of European Studies* 23 (1993), 1–25.
—— 'Un soldat du fascisme: L'Évolution de Joseph Darnand', *Revue d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale* 108 (1977), 43-70.
—— 'The "Vichy Syndrome" Problem in History', *French Historical Studies* 19 (1995), 495–518.
Gorrara, Claire, 'Forgotten crimes? Representing Jewish Experience of the Second World War in French Crime Fiction', *South Central Review* 27 (2010), 3-20.
—— *French Crime Fiction and the Second World War: Past Crimes, Present Memories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).
—— '"Meurtres pour mémoire": remembering the Occupation in the detective fiction of Didier Daeninckx', in Debra Kelly (ed.) *Remembering and Representing the Experience of War in Twentieth-Century France: Committing to Memory* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen, 2000).
—— *Women's Representations of the Occupation in Post-'68 France* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998).
Gregoire, Vincent, 'Sous le signe du gamma: le rôle de la Milice de Vichy dans la littérature de l'immédiate après-guerre', *Symposium* 61 (2007), 117–136.
Grenard, Fabrice, *La France du marché noir (1940-1949)* (Paris: Payot, 2008).
Groot, Jerome de, *The Historical Novel* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010),
Guitard-Auviste, Ginette, *Paul Morand (1888-1976): Légende et vérités* (Paris:

Balland, 1994).
Gusdorf, Georges, 'Conditions et limites de l'autobiographie', in Günther Reichenkron and Eric Hasse (eds.), *Formen der Selbstdarstellung: Analekten zu einer Geschichte des literarischen Selbstportraits* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1956).
Hall, W. D., *Politics, Society and Christianity in Vichy France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
Hamel, Yan, *La Bataille des mémoires: La Seconde Guerre mondiale et le roman Français* (Québec, Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2006).
Harris, Frederick J., *Encounters with Darkness: French and German Writer on World War II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).
Hartmann, Marie, *L'Envers de l'Histoire contemporaine: Étude de la « trilogie allemande » de Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (Paris: Société d'études céliniennes, 2006).
Hayman, David, *Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965).
Hewitt, Nicholas, *The Golden Age of Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (Leamington Spa: Berg, 1987).
—— *The Life of Céline: a Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).
—— *Literature and the Right in Postwar France – The Story of the 'Hussards'* (Oxford, 1996).
—— 'The Literature of the Right and the Liberation: the Case of the 'Hussards'', in H. R Kedward and Nancy Wood (eds.), *The Liberation of France – Image and Event* (Oxford: Berg, 1995).
—— 'Marcel Aymé and the Dark Night of the Occupation', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989).
Higgins, Lynn A., *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics: Fiction and the Representation of History in Postwar France* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1996).
Hirschfeld, Gerhard and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989).
Hoffmann, Stanley, 'Collaboration in France during World War II', *Journal of Modern History* 4 (1968), 375–395.
—— 'In the Looking Glass: Sorrow and Pity?' in Stanley Hoffman (ed.), *Decline or Renewal? France Since the 1930s* (New York: Viking Press, 1974).
—— 'Self-Ensnared: Collaboration with Nazi German', in Stanley Hoffmann (ed.) *Decline or Renewal? France Since the 1930s* (New York: Viking Press, 1974).
—— and Hoffmann, Inge, 'De Gaulle as Political Artist: The Will to Grandeur', in Stanley Hoffmann (ed.) *Decline or Renewal? France Since the 1930s* (New York: Viking Press, 1974).
Holton, Robert, *Jarring Witnesses: Modern Fiction and the Representation of History*, (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994).
Husson, Édouard, *Heydrich et la solution finale* (Paris: Perrin, 2012).
Hux, Samuel, '*The Captive Dreamer* by Christian de la Mazière', *Worldview* 18 (1975), 52–54.
Jäckel, Eberhard, *Frankreich in Hitlers Europa : die deutsche Frankreichpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1966).
Jackson, Julien, *France: The Dark Years, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2001).
—— 'General de Gaulle and His Enemies: Anti-Gaullism in France since 1940', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 9 (1999), 43–65.
—— 'Homosexuality, Collaboration, and Resistance in Occupied France', *Contemporary French Civilization* 21 (2007), 52–81.
—— *The Popular Front in France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
Jardin, Marie-Claude, *Jean-Louis Bory*, (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1991).
Jenkins, Keith, *On 'What is History?' From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White* (London: Routledge, 1995).
Joly, Laurent , *Darquier de Pellepoix et l'antisémitisme français* (Paris: Berg International, 2002).
Jones, Kathryn N., *Memories of the Second World War in French and German Literature, 1960-1980* (London: Maney, 2007).
Judaken, Jonathan, 'Intellectuals, Culture, and the Vichy Years: Reappraisals and New Perspectives', *Contemporary French Civilization* 31 (2007), 83–115.
Kaempfer, Jean, *Poétique du récit de guerre* (Paris: José Corti, 1998).
Kaplan, Alice, *The Collaborator: the trial & execution of Robert Brasillach* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
Karlsgodt, Elizabeth Campbell, *Defending National Treasures: French Art and heritage under Vichy* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).
Kaspi, André, *Les Juifs pendant l'Occupation* (Paris: Seuil, 1991).
Kedward, H. R., 'Patriots and Patriotism in Vichy France', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, 32 (1982), 175–192.
Kelly, Michael, 'The View of Collaboration during the 'Après-Guerre', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989).
Kershaw, Angela, 'History of a success: Irène Némirovsky's posthumous reputation, 1944–2004' *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 4 (2011), 79–96.
Kershaw, Ian, *Hitler, 1889-1936: Hubris* (London: Penguin, 1998).
Koreman, Megan, 'The Collaborator's Penance: The Local Purge, 1944-5', *Contemporary European History* 6 (1997), 177–192.
Laborie, Pierre, *Le chagrin et le venim: La France sous l'Occupation, mémoire et idées recues* (Paris: Bayard, 2011).
—— *L'Opinion française sous Vichy* (Paris: Seuil, 1990).
Lamarque, Peter, 'Narrative and Invention: The Limits of Fictionality' in C. Nash (ed.), *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature* (London, Routledge, 1990).
Lambauer, Barbara, *Otto Abetz et les Français ou l'envers de la Collaboration* (Paris: Fayard, 2001).
Lambert, Pierre Philippe, and Gérard Le Marec, *Les Français sous le casque allemand* (Paris: Jacques Grancher, 1994).
Laurens, André, *Une police politique sous l'occupation: La Milice françaisé en Ariège, 1942-1944* (Foix: Broche, 1982).
Laurens, Corran, '"Femme au Turban": les femmes tondues', in H.R. Kerward and Nancy Wood (eds.), *The Liberation of France: Image and Event* (Oxford: Berg, 1995).
Leenhardt, Pierre, *Pascal Copeau (1908-1982): L'Histoire préfère les vainqueurs* (Paris: Harmattan, 1994).
Lebow, Richard Ned, 'The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe' in Richard Ned

Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
Lécureur, Michel, 'Les Articles de Marcel Aymé pendant l'occupation', *Littératures* 7 (1983), 97–105.
—— *Marcel Aymé: Un Honnête homme* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres/Archimbaud, 1997).
Lehman, David, *Sign of the Times: Deconstruction and the Fall of Paul de Man* (New York: Poseidon, 1991).
Lévy, Claude and Paul Tillard, *La Grande Rafle du Vel d'Hiv: 16 juillet 1942* (Paris: Tallandier, 2012).
Lewis, David, 'Truth in Fiction', *American Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (1978), 37-46.
Littell, Jonathan and Pierre Nora, "Conversation sur l'histoire et le roman", *Le Débat* 144 (2007), 25–44.
Lloyd, Christopher, *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France: Representing Treason and Sacrifice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003).
—— 'In the Service of the Enemy: The Traitor in French Occupation Narratives' *French Cultural Studies* 22 (2011), 239–249.
—— 'Irene Nemivrovsky's "Suite Francaise" and the Crisis of Rights and Identity', *Contemporary French Civilization* 31 (2007), 161-182.
—— 'Liberté et criminalité dans "Le Chemin des écoliers"', *Littératures contemporaines* 5 (1998), 127-139.
—— *Uranus: La Tête des autres* (Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Publications, 1994).
Lord, Graham, *Marcel Aymé* (Berne: Peter Lang Publishers, 1987).
Lottamn, Herbert, *L'Épuration 1943-1953* (Paris: Fayard, 1986).
Louvrier, Pascal, *Brasillach: L'illusion fasciste* (Paris: Perrin, 1989).
Margolis, Joseph, *The Language of Art and Art Criticism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965).
Martens, Stéphan, *La France, l'Allemagne et la Seconde Guerre mondiale: Quelles mémoires?* (Bordeaux: Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, 2007).
Matthews, J. H., *The Inner Dream: Céline as Novelist* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1978).
Mazière, Christian de la, *Le Rêveur casqué* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1972).
McCarthy, Patrick, *Céline*, (London: Allen Lane, 1975).
McCullagh, C. Behan, *The Truth of History* (London: Routledge, 1998).
Merglen, Albert, 'Soldats Français sous uniformes allemands 1941-1945: LVF et « Waffen-SS » Français', *Revue d'histoire de la deuxième guerre mondiale* 108 (1977), 71–84.
Moore, Alison M., 'History, Memory and Trauma in Photography of the Tondues: Visuality of the Vichy Past through the Silent Image of Women', *Gender & History* 17 (1995), 657–681.
Moreau, Jérôme, *Sous le signe de la roue solaire: Itinéraire politique de Saint-Loup* (Paris: L'Æncre, 2002).
Morris, Alan, 'A Child in Time: Patrick Modiano and the Memory of the Occupation', in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European Memories of the Second World War* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999).
—— 'And the "Bande" Played On: An Intertext for Patrick Modiano's *Les Boulevards de ceinture*', in John E. Flower (ed.), *Patrick Modiano*

(Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2007).
—— *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed – Writers and the "Mode Rétro" in Post-Gaullist France* (Oxford: Berg, 1992).
—— *Patrick Modiano* (Oxford: Berg, 1996).
Moses, John W., 'Vision Denied in Night and Fog and Hiroshima Mon Amour', *Literature/Film Quarterly* 14 (1987), 159–163.
Mosse, George, 'Two World Wars and the Myth of War Experience', *Journal of Contemporary History* 21 (4), 491–531.
Müller, Dieter, *Discours réaliste et discours satirique: L'Écriture dans les romans politiques de Marcel Aymé* (Genève: Slatkine, 1993).
Namer, Gerard, *La Commeration en France de 1945 à nos jours* (Paris: Harmattan, 1987).
Nettelbeck, Colin, 'Céline', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989*).*
—— 'Getting the Story Right: Narratives of the Second World War in Post-1968 France', in Gerhard Hirschfeld and Patrick Marsh (eds.), *Collaboration in France – Politics and Culture during the Nazi Occupation, 1940-1944* (Oxford: Berg, 1989*).*
Noort, Kimberly Philpot van, *Paul Morand: The Politics and Practice of Writing in Post-War France* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2001).
Nora, Pierre, 'La Fin de l'Histoire-Mémoire', in Pierre Nora (ed.) *Les Lieux de Mémoire* 1: *La République* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984).
Novick, Peter, *The Resistance Versus Vichy – The Purge of Collaborators in Liberated France* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1968).
O'Keefe, Charles, *A Riffaterrean Reading of Patrick Modiano's La place de l'étoile* (Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 2005).
Ory, Pascal, *Les Collaborateurs 1940–1945* (Paris: Seuil, 1976).
Ostrovsky, Erika, *Céline and his Vision* (London, University of London Press, 1967).
Paxton, Robert O., *The Anatomy of Fascism* (London: Allen Lane, 2004).
—— *Vichy France – Old Guard and New Order 1940-1944* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972).
Péan, Pierre, *Une jeunesse française: François Mitterrand, 1934-1947* (Paris: Fayard, 2011).
Peitsch, Helmut, Charles Burdett, and Claire Gorrara (eds.), *European Memories of the Second World War* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999).
Philipponnat, Olivier and Patrick Lienhardt, *La Vie d'Irène Némirovsky, 1903-1942* (Paris, Grasset/Denoël: 2007).
Picaper, Jean-Paul, and Ludwig Norz, *Enfants maudits*, (Paris: Éditions des Syrtes, 2004).
Plaît, Antoine, 'Les jeunes Français volontaires sous l'uniforme allemand (1941-1945) in Jean-William Dereymez (ed.) *Être jeune en France (1939-1945)* (Paris: Harmattan, 2001).
Rajsfus, Maurice, *La Police de Vichy. Les forces de l'ordre françaises au service de la Gestapo. 1940-1944* (Paris: Le Cherche-midi, 1995).
Rasson, Luc, 'When the SS man says I: on Robert Merle, Michel Rachline and Jonathan Littell', Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd (eds.) *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939-2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).

Redfern, Walter, *Michel Tournier: Le Coq de bruyère* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1996).
Riedweg, Eugène, *Les «Malgré nous»: Histoire de l'incorporation de force des Alsaciens-Mosellans dans l'armée Allemande* (Strasbourg: la Nuée Bleue, 2008).
Ricœur, Paul, *La Mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*, (Paris: Seuil, 2000).
—— *Temps et récit* 1, (Paris: Seuil, 1983).
Rochebrune, Renaud de, and Jean-Claude Hazera, *Les Patrons sous l'Occupation,* (Paris: Broché, 1995).
Rolfe, Leonard, *The Novels of André Chamson* (New York: Vantage, 1971).
Roth, Philip, *The Facts: A Novelist's Autobiography* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1988).
Rousso, Henry, *Un Château en Allemagne. La France de Pétain en exil, Sigmaringen 1944-1945* (Paris: Ramsay, 1980).
—— *La Hantise du passé: entretien avec Philippe Petit* (Paris: Textuel, 1998).
—— 'Le Syndrome de l'historien', *French Historical Studies* 19 (1995).
—— *Le Syndrome de Vichy : De 1944 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil, 2nd edn., 1990).
—— *Vichy: L'événement, la mémoire, l'histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992).
Roux, Baptiste, *Figures de l'occupation dans l'oeuvre de Patrick Modiano* (Paris: Harmattan, 1999).
Roux, Dominique de and Michel Thélia (eds.), *Les Cahiers de L'Herne: Louis-Ferdinand Céline I* (Paris: Diffusion, 1963).
Rubenstein, Diane, 'Publish or perish: the épuration of French Intellectuals', *Journal of European Studies* 13 (1993), 71–99.
Ryan, Donna, *The Holocaust and the Jews of Marseille; The Enforcement of Anti-Semitic Policies in Vichy France* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996).
Sankey, Margaret, 'L'Exemple du « Roi des Aulnes »' in Arlette Bouloumié and Maurice de Gandillac (eds.), *Images et signes de Michel Tournier: Actes du colloque du Centre Culturel International de Cerisy-la-Salle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991).
Sanyal, Debarati, 'The French War', in Marina MacKay (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un collaborateur ?', *Situations* 3 (Paris: Gallimard, 1947).
Sheringham, Michael, *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
Schulte Nordholt, Annelise, *Perec, Modiano, Raczymow: La génération d'après et la mémoire de la Shoah* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008).
Seel, Pierre, *Moi, Pierre Seel, déporté homosexuel*, (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1994).
Shields, James G., 'Charlemagne's Crusaders: French Collaboration in Arms, 1941-1945', *French Cultural Studies* 18 (2007), 83–105.
Shirer, William, *The Collapse of the Third Republic* (London: Heinemann, 1970).
Simonin, Anne, 'The Right to Innocence: Literary Discourse and the Postwar Purges (1944–1953)', *Yale French Studies* 98 (2000), 5–28.
Sparshott, F. E., 'Truth in Fiction', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 26 (1967), 3-7.
Spear, Thomas, 'De l'Autofiction', in Peter Dunwoodie (ed.), *Actes du colloque international de Londres* (Paris: Lérot & Société études Céliniennes, 1989).

Spotts, Frederic, *The Shameful Peace: How French Artists and Intellectuals Survived the Nazi Occupation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).
Spurdle, Sonia, 'Food for Thought in Jean Dutourd's 'Au Bon Beurre'' *Romance Studies* 7 (1989), 89–103.
Suleiman, Susan Rubin, *Authoritarian Fictions: The Ideological Novel as a Literary Genre* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).
—— *Crises of memory and the Second World War* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2006),
Sweets, John F., *Choices in Vichy France: The French under Nazi Occupation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
Tame, Peter, 'André Chamson's Novel "Le Puits des miracles": France at War?', *Forum of Modern Language Studies* 41 (2005), 226–237.
Thiébot, Emmanuel, *Chroniques de la vie des Français sous l'Occupation* (Paris: Larousse, 2011).
Todorov, Tzvetan, *Une Tragédie française: Eté 44, scènes de guerre civile* (Paris: Seuil, 2004).
Touchard, Jean, *Le Gaullisme 1940-1969* (Paris: Seuil, 1978).
Tournier, Michel, *Le vent Paraclet* (Paris: Gallimard, 1977).
Trigg, Jonathan, *Hitler's Gauls: The History of the 33rd Waffen-SS Division Charlemagne* (Stroud: Spellmount, 2009).
Tumblety, Joan, "The Real and The Imaginary: Political Discourse and Gender in France during the Occupation, 1940-1944", *European Legacy* 1 (1996), 31-35.
Venner, Dominique, *Histoire de la collaboration* (Paris: Pygmalion, 2002).
Vinen, Richard, *The Unfree French – Life under the Occupation* (London: Penguin, 2006).
Virgili, Fabrice, *La France "virile": des femmes tondues à la libération* (Paris, Payot, 2000).
—— 'Les Tontes de la Libération en France', *Les Cahiers de l'Institut d'histoire du temps présent* 31 (1995). Available at: http://www.ihtp.cnrs.fr/spip.php%3Farticle247&lang=fr.html. Accessed on 13 March 2013.
Wahl, Alfred, and Jean-Claude Richez, *L'Alsace entre France et Allemagne, 1850-1950* (Paris: Hachette, 1994).
Walker, I. H., 'Corinne Luchaire, précurseur de Céline?' *Australian Journal of French Studies* 25 (1988), 42–50.
Walton, Kendell L., 'How Remote are Fictional Worlds from the Real World?', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 37 (1978), 11–23.
Watts, Philip, *Allegories of the Purge – How Literature Responded to the Postwar Trials of Writers and Intellectuals in France* (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1998).
Weitz, Morris, 'Truth in Literature', *Revue international de philosophie* 9 (1955), 116–129.
White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
—— 'The Historical Text as Literary Artefact' in Hayden White (ed.), *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
—— 'The question of narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory', *History and Theory* 23 (1984), 1–33.

—— *Topics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
Wood, Nancy, 'Crimes or misdemeanours? Memory on trial in contemporary France', *French Cultural Studies* 5 (1994), 1–21.
—— *Vectors of Memory – Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe* (Oxford, 1999).
Yagil, Limore, *Chrétiens et juifs sous Vichy (1940–1944): Sauvetage et désobéissance civile* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
Zimmer, Christian, 'La Paille dans le discours de l'ordre', *Les Temps modernes* 336 (July 1974), 2492–2505.